**Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 266--80th Congress

Chapter 356--1st Session

H. R. 3601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 266 . . . . . 1

Index and Summary of History on H. R. 3601 . . . . . 4

Index to Debate on H. R. 3601 . . . . . 6

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 266

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948. With the exception of corporate funds, permanent appropriations, and payments received from other agencies for furnishing food and other agricultural commodities and services, this Act carries most of the funds available to the Department.

Funds made available for 1948 (including $119,429,710 in permanent appropriations and $225,000,000 authorization to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury) total $960,044,908, a decrease of $314,641,143, or 24.7% compared with 1947 appropriations, reappropriations and RFC borrowing authorizations (no reappropriations authorized in 1948 Act). The major changes in available funds are as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM -- $228,000,000 appropriated plus $37,635,044 available from advance conservation material fund results in a decrease below 1947 of approximately $48,600,000 -- $36,100,000 for the regular program and $12,500,000 for the special seed program: administrative expenses are limited to $24,500,000, a decrease of approximately $4,400,000 below 1947; the Act also authorizes a $150,000,000 program for the 1948 crop year with maximum payments to any participant to be limited to $500.

SUGAR ACT -- $55,000,000 ($1,500,000 above 1947).

To carry out the purposes and provisions of the NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT, the Act makes $65,000,000 of Section 32 funds available, with the provision that no part of the funds shall be used for nonfood assistance ($75,000,000 of Section 32 funds and a direct appropriation of $6,000,000 available in 1947).

MARKETING SERVICES activities $9,389,250 -- a net reduction of $988,822 below 1947 which represents a net budget decrease of $1,121,615

due to elimination of war food orders, regulations, etc. and several increases for various marketing service activities.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION -- $5,000,000 for operating expenses ($2,790,000 below 1947) to be used for liquidating existing program and for continuation of insurance on an experimental basis.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE -- $39,048,000 (a reduction of $5,675,000 below 1947).

For the FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION, the following amounts are provided: Farm tenancy loans, $15,000,000 ($35,000,000 below 1947); production and subsistence loans, $60,000,000 (approximately $35,600,000 below 1947); farm tenant mortgage insurance fund, $1,000,000 (new item); and salaries and expenses, $21,000,000 (approximately $13,400,000 below 1947).

The Act contains a new appropriation item of $9,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of the RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946.

It also provides $5,000,000 for administrative expenses of the RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM ($550,000 below 1947) and authorizes borrowing of $225,000,000 ($25,000,000 below 1947) from the Secretary of the Treasury rather than from RFC as in prior years.

For the AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION total appropriations of $51,063,635 are provided, a decrease of $6,133,835 below 1947. $5,400,000 of this decrease is in the appropriation for meat inspection, for which a working capital fund of $5,000,000 is provided, to be reimbursed from fees charged packers for the total cost of meat inspection services in lieu of the direct appropriation of $10,400,000 available in 1947. Other major items of decrease are: Pink bollworm control $265,500; dutch elm disease control, $215,100; control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, $750,000; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, $207,000; and special research fund $100,000.

The Act also provides $3,750,000 for WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL ($2,250,000 below 1947).

FLOOD CONTROL, in addition to prior year balances available, $1,000,000, of which $500,000 shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers and their tributaries (1947 appropriation $2,100,000 plus unobligated balances).

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, $4,375,400 ($413,507 below 1947).

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS, $503,000 ($225,000 below 1947).

For FOREST SERVICE the Act makes available $45,582,391 (including permanent appropriations), a decrease of $5,854,609 below 1947. In addition, $16,300,000 is available for FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS, a decrease of $9,914,222 below 1947 -- $8,414,222 for forest highways and $1,500,000 for forest development roads.

The Act also contains a new language provision waiving personal services limitations contained in the Act to the extent necessary to make lumpsum, terminal leave payments to employees.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 3601

| | |
|---|---|
| March 17, 1947 | Hearings: House, H. R. 3601, Pt. 1. |
| March 28, 1947 | Documents: The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in the Budget and in House Documents Nos. 186 and 214. |
| April 2, 1947 | Hearings: House, H. R. 3601, Pt. 2. |
| May 23, 1947 | House Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 3601. House Report 450. Print of the bill as reported. Full Committee Prints of the bill and report. |
| May 26, 1947 | House Rules Committee reported House Resolution 218 for the consideration of H. R. 3601. House Report 463. Print of the Resolution as reported. |
| May 27, 1947 | House Resolution 218 considered and agreed to. Print of the Resolution. |
| | House began debate on H. R. 3601. |
| May 28, 1947 | House debate concluded. H. R. 3601 passed House with amendments. Remarks of Rep. J. R. Bryson. |
| May 29, 1947 | H. R. 3601 was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of the bill as referred. Remarks of Rep. Cannon. |
| June 12, 1947 | Hearings: Senate, H. R. 3601. |
| July 11, 1947 | The Senate Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 3601 with amendments. Senate Report 474. Committee Print of the bill and report. |
| July 14, 1947 | H. R. 3601 was debated in the Senate and passed with amendments. |
| | Senate Conferees appointed. |
| | Print of H. R. 3601 with the amendments of the Senate numbered. |
| July 15, 1947 | House Conferees appointed. |
| July 17, 1947 | House received the Conference Report. House Report 975. |
| July 18, 1947 | House agreed to the Conference Report and acted on the amendments in disagreement. |

| | |
|---|---|
| July 21, 1947 | Senate agreed to the Conference Report and acted on the amendments in disagreement. Senate asked for further conference. |
| | Senate Conferees appointed for 2d Conference. |
| July 22, 1947 | House Conferees appointed for 2d Conference. |
| | House received 2d Conference Report. House Report 1036. |
| July 24, 1947 | House agreed to 2d Conference Report. |
| July 26, 1947 | Senate agreed to 2d Conference Report. |
| July 30, 1947 | Approved. Public Law 266. |

INDEX TO DEBATE ON

H. R. 3601


Page

AAA See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Agricultural Research Administration . . . . . 9021

American Farm Bureau Federation . . . . 6023, 6033, 6109

Appropriations, decrease 6023-4, 6035-6, 6040-1, 6045-6, 6105
6134, 6137-8, 6140, 6152, 6163-4, 6167, 6178, 9461-3, 10108

Bureau of Agricultural Economics . . . . . 6120, 9021

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry . . . 6129

Bureau of Animal Industry
Meat Inspection . . . . . 6027-8, 6123-8, 9019, 9022
9462, 9463, 9471-4, 9647, 10103, 10487-10488

Bureau of Dairy Industry
Woodward, Oklahoma Station . . . . . 6128-9

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics . . . . 9462

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering
Woodward, Oklahoma Station . . . . . 6129

Charts and Tables See: Statistics.

Commodity Credit Corporation . . . . . 6025-6, 6028
. . . . . 6051-2, 6053, 6056, 6058, 9026

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources
See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Crop Insurance . . . . . A2710-11, 6045, 9019

Extension Service . . . . . 6135

Farm Credit . . . . . 6043

Farm income . . . . . 6023-4, 6060-61

Farm Program . . . . 6041-4, 6103-4, 6107-8, 6158, 6167

INDEX TO PAGES ON

R. 9601


AAA See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Agricultural Research Administration . . . . . 9021

American Farm Bureau Federation . . . . . 6021, 6023, 6129

Appropriations, decrease 6023-4, 6025-6, 6040-1, 6045-6, 6104, 6124, 6127-8, 6140, 6152, 6163-4, 6167, 6172, 9401-3, 10108

Bureau of Agricultural Economics . . . . . 6120, 9021

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry . . . 6129

Bureau of Animal Industry
Inspection . . . . . 9477-4, 9647, 10103,

of Dairy Industry
Woodward, Oklahoma Station . . . . . 6124-9

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics . . . .

of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering
Woodward, Oklahoma . . . . . 6129

Charts and Tables See: Statistics.

Commodity Credit Corporation . . . . . 6025-6, 6027
. . . . . 6051-4, 6053, 6054, 6058, 9026

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources
See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Crop Insurance . . . . . 6045, 9019

Extension Service . . . . . 6129

Farm Credit . . . . . 6043

Farm Income . . . . . 6022-4, 6040-41

Farm Program . . . . 6041-4, 6102-4, 6107-9, 6156, 6167

Farm Real Estate Prices . . . . . 6038, 6120-21, 6161

Farm Security Administration . . . . . 6043, 6056, 6122

Farmers' Home Administration 6033-4, 6035, 6045, 6059, 6105
. . . . 6106, 6120-22, 6160-62, 6163, 6165, 9018, 9463
. . . . . 9493-96, 9671, 9679-80
Emergency Crop and Feed Loans . . . . . 6122

Veterans' loans . . . .6033-4, 6036, 6038, 6045, 6120-1
. . . . . 6160, 6161-2, 9018, 9493

Fish and Fisheries . . . . . 6115-8

Flood Control . . . . . 9658

Food Controls . . . . . 6178

Food Exports . . . . . 6178

Food Production . . . . . .6059-60

Forest Service . . . . . 6044-5, 6056-7, 6129, 6131-4
Forest Diseases . . . . . 6131-3
Madison Research Laboratory . . . 6044-5, 6057, 6129-31
Roads and Trails . . . . . 6057, 9019

Information . . . . . 9021

Marketing. See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Meat Inspection. See Bureau of Animal Industry.

Motion to recommit the bill . . . . . 6177, 6179-80

Office of Experiment Stations . . . . . 9021-2

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations 6040, 6122-3, 9024-5

Penalty Mail . . . . . 9021, 10103

Personnel, reduction . . . . . 6035

Points-of-order . . . . . 6022-9

Price Support . . . . . 6028, 6032, 6043, 6050-2

Production and Marketing Administration
Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources . 6028
. . 6032, 6034-5, 6036, 6039, 6045, 6046, 6049, 6056, 6058

Farm Real Estate Prices . . . . . .

Farm Security Administration . . . . . 6043, 6056, 6122

Home Administration 6033-4, 6035, 6045, 6059, 6106
. . . . 6106, 6120-22, 6160-62, 6163, 6165, 9018,
. . . . . 9429-30, 5621, 9479-
Emergency Crop and Feed Loans . . . . . .

Veterans' Loans . . . 6033-4, 6036, 6038, 6046, 6120-1
. . . . . 6160, 6161-2, 9018, 9429

Fish and Fisheries . . . . . 6115-8

Flood Control . . . . . 9439

Food Controls . . . . . 6173

Food Exports . . . . . 6179

Food Production . . . . . 6-9

Service . . . . . 904 -
Forest Diseases . . . . . 6131-3
Madison Research Laboratory . . . 6044-5,
Roads and Trails . . . . . 6057, 9019

Information . . . . . 9021

Marketing. See: Production and Marketing Administration.

Meat Inspection. See Bureau of Animal Industry.

Notice to recount the hill . . . . . 6177, 6179-80

Office of Experiment Stations . . . . . 9021-2

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations 6040, 6122-3,

Mail . . . . . 9021, 10109

, reduction . . . . . 6035

Points-of-order . . . . . 6022-9

Price Support . . . . . 6028, 6032, 6043, 6050-2

Production and Marketing Administration . . . 6023
Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources . 6023
. . 6032, 6034-5, 6036, 6038, 6042, 6046, 6049, 6056, 6058

Production and Marketing Administration (Continued)
Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources . 6061
. . 6104, 6106, 6114, 6136-40, 6141-5, 6146-9, 6151, 6163
. .6165-6, 6179, 9018, 9020, 9026-7, 9462-3, 9465, 9474-87
. .9489, 9490, 9647-56, 9657, 9659, 9671-3, 10103-5, 10108
. . . . . 10109, 10488-9

Marketing Agreements and Orders . . . . . 6159

Market News Service . . . . . 6160

Remount Stations . . . . . 9663-71

Research and Marketing Act . 6035, 6039-40, 6047, 6050, 6052
. . . . . .6058, 6104, 6105, 6110-13, 6114
. . . . . 6115-18, 6134, 6146, 6178, 9021, 9025-6

Rural Electrification Administration . 6027, 6030-32, 6035
. . 6041, 6043, 6046-8, 6050, 6055, 6056, 6059, 6061, 6105
. . . . .6106, 6107, 6109, 6113-15, 6157, 6164, 6167-77
. . . . . .6179, 9018-19, 9020, 9466, 9656-57

School Lunch Program 6024, 6026-7, 6037-8, 6054, 6059, 6106
. . . . 6147, 6152, 6153-7, 6158, 6159, 6165, 6179, 9019
. . . . 9026, 9463, 9465, 9489, 9490-93, 9650, 9678-9
. . . . . .10105-6, 10109, 10487-9

Secreatry's Office . . . . . 6033, 6108-9, 6110

Section 32 Funds . . 6024-8, 6030, 6035, 6037, 6039, 6040
6049-54, 6056, 6058, 6060, 6061, 6105, 6108
6134, 6146, 6159, 6177-8, 9019, 9020, 9489-90

Soil Conservation Service . . . 6046, 6042-4, 6048, 6054
. . . . . 6058, 6061-2, 6106, 6110, 6114, 6134-5
. . . . . .9489, 9654-5, 9659-63,9671-3, 9676-77
Research . . . . . 6036
Soil Conservation Districts 6036, 6054, 6134, 6145, 9489

Soil Erosion . . . . . 6037, 9676-7

Solicitor's Office . . . . . 6031, 6033, 6118-9, 9021

Statistics
Conservation Payments . . . . . 9026-7
Conservation Program . . . . . 9673
Loan authorizations . . . . . 10106
School Lunch . . . . . 9026
Wool . . . . . .9026

Steagall Amendment . . . . . 6050-1

Sugar . . . . . 6149, 6152

Tables and Charts.
See: Statistics.

Tobacco . . . . . 6117

Tornado Damage
See: Bureau of Dairy Industry.
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering

War Assets Administration
Release of surplus farm land . . . . . 6034

Wool, statistics . . . . . 9026

80th Congress, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | Document No. 186

# REVISED ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## COMMUNICATION

FROM

## THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

REVISED ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1948 IN THE FORM OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET FOR SAID FISCAL YEAR

March 28, 1947.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriation and ordered to be printed

The White House,
*Washington, March 27, 1947.*

The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a revised estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1948 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its transmission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

Harry S. Truman.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington 25, D. C., March 27, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a revised estimate of appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1948, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

On page 1203 of the Budget, column 2, under the subhead "Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture," decrease the estimate for administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation from "$8,500,000" to "$8,450,000," and delete the words "(to be computed on an accrual basis)" in lines 4 and 5; and decrease the amount by which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation (in line 17 of the paragraph) from "$830,380,811" to "$641,832,080.64".

Since the transmission of the 1948 Budget to the Congress, a study of the administrative expense accounting of the Production and Marketing Administration, of which the Commodity Credit Corporation is a component, has been instituted. The activities of the Corporation are so integrated with those financed from appropriated funds administered by the Production and Marketing Administration that the Corporation's administrative expense accounts are maintained in the same manner as for appropriated funds, that is, on an obligation basis. To account for the Corporation's administrative costs on an accrual basis, as contemplated by the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597) and specified in the 1948 Budget, would require the maintenance of dual systems of accounts at an additional cost of $50,000 a year. It has been concluded that the resulting benefits would not justify the expense necessary to effect this accounting refinement. It is therefore recommended that the provision in the 1948 Budget requiring the Corporation to account for its administrative expenses on an accrual basis be deleted, and the authorization to expend Corporation funds for administrative expenses be reduced from $8,500,000 to $8,450,000. If in the future the organization of the Production and Marketing Administration should be changed so that the Corporation's operations are distinguishable and separable from those financed from appropriated funds, the Corporation's accounts will be maintained in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions as contemplated by the Government Corporation Control Act.

The act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1), directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, if the appraisal results in his finding that the net worth of the Corporation is less than $100,000,000, directs the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, to restore the Corporation's capital to that sum. At the time of the transmission of the 1948 Budget, this impairment was estimated to be $830,380,811. It was further stated in the

Budget document that the amount would be subject to adjustment upon receipt of the appraisal report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in a report dated March 13, 1947, has determined the impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be $641,832,080.64 as of June 30, 1946. The major factor in this reduction of $188,548,730.36 from the earlier budget estimate results from the accounting treatment accorded the "mark-up" on the Corporation's general commodities purchase program. The Corporation had set aside such sums in a reserve to insure compliance with the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 16, 1943 (15 U. S. C. 713a–9), pending final accounting for its operations under this program. The Secretary's appraisal report, however, recommends that this reserve of $178,697,601.59 be transferred to the net worth of the Corporation as of June 30, 1946, thus reducing its capital impairment by that amount. Other adjustments in accrued liabilities, valuation reserves, etc., account for the remainder of the reduction from $830,380,811 to $641,832,080.64.

It should be observed, however, that this revision in the amount of impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not result in a reduction in over-all budgetary expenditures of the Government. While the expenditures of the Treasury from general and special accounts are reduced by $188,548,730.36, the receipts in the checking account of the Commodity Credit Corporation will be decreased by a similar amount, resulting in no change in the Federal Budget.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the 1948 budget be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
*Director of the Bureau of the Budget.*

80TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { DOCUMENT No. 214

# SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

## COMMUNICATION

FROM

# THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

A SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1948 IN THE AMOUNT OF $10,000,000

APRIL 23, 1947.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, April 23, 1947.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $10,000,000.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its transmission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington 25, D. C., April 22, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $10,000,000 for the Treasury Department, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:
To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504), fiscal year 1948 ..... $10,000,000

In the transmission of the 1948 Budget to the Congress, it was anticipated that cotton indemnity claims on the 1946 crop would exceed cotton premiums by $17,893,000, and that the $20,000,000 included in the Budget, together with capital already available to the Corporation, would be adequate to pay losses as well as provide operating cash needed in financing the 1947 crop-insurance program. The latest estimate, prepared as of March 18, 1947, indicates that indemnity claims on cotton will exceed premium collections by $41,600,000, an increase of about $23,700,000 over the previous loss estimate.

The House Committee on Appropriations, in reporting the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, included an appropriation of $20,000,000 to liquidate the cotton-indemnity claims on the 1946 crop. The committee report on the bill states that the committee had "advanced" the item from the 1948 budget. This item was approved by the House as reported by the committee and, if approved by the Senate, adequate funds will be available to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for completion of the 1946 program. There is, however, urgent need for additional funds to meet the cash requirements of the Corporation in connection with 1947 crop-insurance operations.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1504 (a)) authorizes the issuance of capital stock in the amount of $100,000,000. Assuming the subscription of the additional capital stock contemplated by the appropriation carried in the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, there will remain an unsubscribed capital stock authorization of $10,000,000.

Insurance contracts on 1947 crops have already been entered into by the Corporation pursuant to existing law and, in order to carry out the commitments involved, the Corporation will require additional funds for the fiscal year 1948 which can be made available by appropriating an amount equal to the unsubscribed balance of the capital-stock authorization, $10,000,000. This may not make available sufficient funds to permit the Corporation to carry out effectively its 1947 crop operations, in which event an amendment of the basic statute increasing the capital stock will be necessary. The Department of Agriculture advises that the extent to which additional capital requirements may be needed cannot be determined at this time.

I recommend that this supplemental estimate be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
*Director, Bureau of the Budget.*

DIGEST OF
# CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 26, 1947
For actions of May 23, 1947
80th-1st, No. 98

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7,13
Agricultural Appropriation bill,1948 (individual items not indexed)..... 1
Appropriations.....1,25,26
Census.....27
Cooperatives.....11
Economic report.....10
Fats and oils..... 8
Fertilizers..... 8
Fisheries.....16
Flood control.....20
Food, administration.....18
Foreign affairs.....6,19,24
Forests and forestry.....28
Grain..... 8
Labor, farm.....14
Lands..... 5
Lands, reclamation.....22
Machinery, farm.....21
Marketing.....15
Prices..... 4
Prices, support..... 2
Potatoes.....3,9
Taxation.....12,15,17,23
Trade, foreign..... 8
War powers.....8
Wool..... 2

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported agricultural appropriation bill. House passed compromise wool bill. House Rules Committee reported resolution for potato-surplus investigation. Both Houses received President's request for 1-year extension of certain allocation-priorities powers and Export Control Act. Sen. Capper introduced bill to provide for Federal-State farm-labor cooperation. Sen. Hatch inserted USDA statement discussing surplus-potato problem. Sen. Morse discussed Economic Report, mentioning its lack of recommendation on agricultural policy. President approved Second Deficiency Appropriation Act.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3601 (H. Rept. 450)(p. 5910).

Representatives of the Department agencies have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions on the Budget estimates. Copies of the bill, report, and hearings will be distributed as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has already been worked out with the bureaus and offices. Except in case of unavoidable emergency, copies should be obtained through the bureau budget offices rather than from this office. General debate on the bill is expected to begin on the floor of the House today or tomorrow. (Note.-- For the latest word on this point, please call B&F on Ext. 4654.) The table on the next page contains a summary comparison of the Committee actions with the 1948 Budget estimates, and with total anticipated funds available in 1947.

Committee actions of special significance include: (1) a decrease of $136,105,710 below the Budget and $148,631,710 below 1947 in funds for the AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM (amount in the Bill, $165,614,290); (a) a reduction of $18,584,956 below the Budget and $13,910,956 below 1947 in the overall limitation on administrative expenses for this program-- eliminates aerial photographic laboratory, but provides the Budget estimate for the tobacco marketing quota program, (amount in the Bill, $15,000,000, distributed as follows: State and national expenses, $1,950,000; county association expenses, $13,050,000); (b) prohibits use of funds for formulation or administration of an Agricultural Conservation Program for the 1948 crop year; and (c) provides that payments to farmers under the 1947 program shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant that he has carried out the conservation practices and complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payment; (2) rescission of funds

HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION ON 1948 BUDGET ESTIMATES

| Item | 1947 available funds | Budget Estimates 1948 | Committee Bill 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (-) Committee Bill compared with 1947 available funds | Budget Estimates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct appropriations | $643,154,411 | $805,141,608 | $569,713,866 | $ -73,440,545 | $-235,427,742 |
| Reappropriations | 133,784,292 | -- | -- | -133,784,292 | -- |
| Permanent appropriations | 127,747,348 | 158,429,710 | 10,429,710 | -117,317,638 | -148,000,000 |
| Total appropriations and reappropriations | $904,686,051 | $963,571,318 | $580,143,576 | $-324,542,475 | $-383,427,742 |
| Borrowings authorized: | | | | | |
| From RFC | 370,000,000 | 225,000,000 | -- | -370,000,000 | -225,000,000 |
| From U. S. Treasury | -- | -- | 225,000,000 | +225,000,000 | +225,000,000 |
| Grand totals, above items | $1,274,686,051 | $1,188,571,318 | $805,143,576 | $-469,542,475 | $-383,427,742 |

appropriated for fiscal year 1948 by SECTION 32, act of August 24, 1935 (estimated at $148,000,000); (3) insertion of a new appropriation item "ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS" in the amount of $525,300 to continue activities relating to the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, presently financed from Section 32 funds; (4) reduction to $45,000,000 in funds for carrying out the provisions of the NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT (1947 available, $81,000,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $75,000,000); Bill prohibits consideration of funds derived from the sale of lunches as State or local contribution for matching purposes; (5) reduces to $1,000,000 administrative funds for the FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION (1947 available, $7,790,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $9,330,000), such funds to be available only for liquidation of the existing program and continuation of trial insurance; (6) eliminates funds for FARM TENANT LOANS program (1947 authorization, $50,000,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $35,000,000); (7) reduces to $1,000,000 funds to establish the FARM TENANT MORTGAGE INSURANCE FUND (Budget estimate, $15,000,000); (8) provides $60,000,000 for PRODUCTION AND SUBSISTENCE LOANS (1947 available, including RFC loan authorization and reappropriations, $95,611,282; 1948 Budget estimate, $90,000,000); (9) reduces to $18,000,000 administrative funds for FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION (1947 available, $34,428,300; 1948 Budget estimate, $30,000,000); (10) reduces to $4,000,000 administrative funds for REA (1947 available, $5,550,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $5,600,000); (11) provides $225,000,000 for rural electrification loans (1947 authorization, $250,000,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $250,000,000); Bill amends REA Act of 1936 to authorize borrowing of loan funds from U. S. Treasury without 85% collateral limitation, and transfers to Treasury as of June 30, 1947 all rights, interests, obligations and duties of RFC arising out of loan authorizations theretofore made; (12) carries $6,000,000 for the RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT of 1946 (1948 Budget estimate, $19,000,000) distributed as follows: $3,000,000 for payment to State agricultural experiment stations; and $1,000,000 each for research on utilization and associated problems, cooperative research other than utilization research, and marketing research and service; (13) reduces to $1,743,600 BAE's funds for "ECONOMIC INVESTIGATIONS" (available 1947, $2,493,607; Budget

estimate, $2,493,600); (14) appropriates $144,940 for RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA (new item), including $44,940 in lieu of payments to Alaska for experiment stations work under Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts; (15) establishes a working capital fund of $5,000,000 for MEAT INSPECTION to be reimbursed from fees charged to packers, thus placing meat inspection service on a self-sustaining basis; (16) decrease of $554,820 below 1948 Budget estimate of $8,608,000 for BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING, including reductions in funds for forest diseases, soil improvement, irrigation, and fertilizer research; (17) decrease of $1,708,600 below Budget estimate of $9,708,400 for BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE, including reductions in funds for eradication and control of Dutch elm disease, pink bollworm, and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases; (18) reductions in FOREST SERVICE funds, including disallowance of Budget increase of $600,000 for timber sales work and reductions of $945,109 in national forest protection and management funds, $200,000 for forest and range management investigations, $555,000 for forest products research, $500,000 for forest resources investigations, $500,000 for acquisition of lands for National Forests; (19) reduces to $15,300,000 funds for FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (appropriated 1947, $26,214,222; 1948 Budget estimate, $23,800,000; $6,000,000 of reduction below Budget applied to forest highways and $2,500,000 to forest development roads); (20) reduces SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE research funds to $673,000 (1947 available and Budget estimate, $1,423,000), and soil conservation operations to $38,000,000 (1947 available, $43,300,000; 1948 Budget estimate, $43,437,000); (21) eliminates Budget increases for reconstruction and repair of dams and spillways on LAND-UTILIZATION PROJECTS; and (22) disallows $500,000 Budget increase for PENALTY MAIL to cover in part increased mailing rate.

The Committee report includes the following statements:

"It is quite clear from the testimony which the committee received from all sources that there is today a new emphasis in agriculture. The accent is on research. It has become almost a household word in the whole domain of agriculture and is a healthy indication that, more and more, farmers and those identified with farm policy are becoming increasingly interested in what is commonly called the know-how of agriculture."

"In appraising the needs of the Department for the next fiscal year and in orienting itself to the needs of agriculture for other years which lie ahead, the committee has given more and more attention and discussion to the question of Federal responsibility for agriculture and to what extent that responsibility should be borne by the Federal Government. It can scarcely be contended that the various States, most of which have comfortable bank balances as distinguished from the Federal Government with a $268,000,000,000 debt, and which derive profit and taxes from our farm domain and from farmers' incomes, do not have a stake in farmers' achievements and in the progress of agriculture."

"Every Member of Congress should read carefully the very excellent statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on the general condition of agriculture as a whole. It is a splendid report and evidences a condition never attained by agriculture in any country in any time or generation. In that statement the Secretary points out that our farm domain was at the very pinnacle of production in 1946 with the greatest production in history. Between 1940 and 1946, the value of assets used in agriculture had increased from 53.7 billion to 101.6 billion, which is an increase of 89 percent in that period. The increase in the proprietor's equity in agriculture increased by 49.5 billion dollars or 113 percent. The value of cash and bonds in the hands of farmers jumped from 4.2 billion to 19 billion while on the other hand farmers' debts dropped from 10 billion to 8.3 billion. The value of farmers' livestock, equipment and inventories had increased by 63 percent and the value of farm lands by 68 percent. Here then, is unparalleled testimony to the splendid conditions of American agriculture."

"The members of the committee, as well as Members of the House generally, are constantly coming across publications and releases whose 'usefulness' in connection with agriculture is of questionable degree. Many recipients of such publications or releases have mailed them to the committee or to Members of the House deploring the waste of public funds in their preparation and mailing."

"The committee has endeavored in its consideration of this bill to effectuate 'selective reductions' based upon the present condition of agriculture and the needs of the future."

Rep. Rayburn, Tex., reserved points of order on the bill (p. 5910).

2. WOOL PRICE SUPPORTS. Passed, 151-65, with amendment S. 814, the wool bill (pp. 5884-910). The bill continues the 1946 support price until Dec. 31, 1948, and requires the President to increase the import tariff on foreign wool whenever deemed necessary by the Tariff Commission. Rejected, 56-110, the Herter amendment to provide price support at 90% of parity (p. 5896). Rejected, 27-102, the Cooley amendment providing that no action taken under this bill shall be in contravention of any international treaty to which the U. S. is, or may become, a party (p. 5905).

3. POTATO SURPLUS. The Rules Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 166, to direct the Agriculture Committee "to institute studies and hold hearings immediately to determine the feasibility and advisability of carrying out a program designed to do away with the annual potato surplus and to report its findings and recommendations to the United States Department of Agriculture" (H. Rept. 444)(pp. 5881-2).

Rep. Gathings, Ark., criticized potato destruction, stating, "I do not believe that the officials of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture have put forth sufficient effort to find a solution to this problem"(pp. 5879-80).

4. PRICES. Reps. Eberharter, Pa., and Holifield, Calif., blamed the Republicans for high prices, etc. (pp. 5911-7).

5. LANDS PATENTS. Received from the Interior Department draft of a proposed bill to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 5918.)

6. FOREIGN RELIEF. Received from the State Department draft of a proposed measure to provide for utilization of UNRRA appropriations for meeting administrative expenses of U.S. Government agencies in connection with UNRRA liquidation. To Foreign Affairs Committee. (p. 5918.)

7. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 26 (p. 5918).

SENATE

8. WAR POWERS; EXPORT CONTROL ACT. Both Houses received the President's message recommending continuation of the Export Control Act and extension for 1 year of certain allocation and priority powers of the Second War Powers Act, including authority "to maintain import controls on fats and oils and rice and rice products" and "to issue priorities for export of nitrogenous fertilizer materials" (H.Doc. 266). To Judiciary Committees. (pp. 5857, 5880-1.)

9. POTATO SURPLUS. Sen. Hatch, N. Mex., inserted a statement by this Department discussing the potato-surplus problem and outlining the efforts which have been made to solve it (pp. 5876-7).

10. ECONOMIC REPORT. Sen. Morse, Oreg., discussed the Economic Report of the Presi-

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Office of the Secretary

Washington, May 23, 1947

Secretary Anderson Comments on USDA Appropriation Bill:

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson today issued the following statement:

The Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill reported out today by the House Appropriations Committee directs a sharp cut at the interests of the American farm family and the general welfare. The greatest harm is done through attacks on the conservation program, the price support program, and assistance to veterans and small farmers. While I appreciate the need for economy, the Department already had reduced its personnel and budget below pre-war levels. The number of full-time employees in March of this year was more than 10,000 below March 1940. The Department of Agriculture is now operating on a budget nearly 375 million dollars smaller than in 1940. The cuts now made by the House Appropriations Committee represent an additional reduction nearly 37 percent below the amount available this year.

If the Congress followed the recommendations of the committee it would in effect be saying to farmers: "The policy legislation on the books means nothing; you have to fight for your rights every time an appropriation bill comes up." The committee action nullifies or drastically restricts the effect of several national farm policies which Congress has adopted and to which both major political parties have pledged continuing support.

Thus is raised a fundamental issue which the farmers and the people of this country recognize as being out of keeping with the times in which we live and the situation in which the problems of our agriculture involve world-wide considerations.

Because farmers are now, in the words of the Committee, "self-reliant," the Committee proposes to weaken the farmer-operated conservation program this year and bury it next year. Debate and voting records on the Department's 1947

appropriation bill, when it was before the House on March 8, 1946, indicated clearly that Congress committed itself to a 300 million dollar agricultural conservation program for the current calendar year. The committee action would cut that about in half. This is the first time it has ever come to my notice that a Committee of Congress has recommended to the Congress a violation of its own contract. The Department was authorized to set up the 1947 ACP program on a 300 million dollar basis. Representatives of the Department, through farmer-elected committeemen all over the nation carried that assurance to the farmers. I still believe the Congress will not repudiate its promise and repudiate the actions it directed the Department to take. I intend to urge the Congress as strongly as I can to restore this item to 300 million dollars.

The committee action would also cut administrative expenses to an extent that would make the program ineffective and would have the Congress commit itself against continuing the program next year. Because of wartime damage to the soil, we should reemphasize, not reduce, the effectiveness of the conservation program. We in the Department cannot favor a death warrant for the farmer-committee system of administering agricultural programs. This is the same farmer-committee system which served the nation in combatting depression, which turned the tide against soil destruction and which geared farm production to the requirements of war and the reestablishment of peace. These farmer elected committees, which have their authorization in the Agricultural Conservation Program, carry a great many responsibilities including vital duties in price support operations. They represent one of agriculture's greatest assets.

I am equally concerned over the practical effect of the bill's provision depriving agriculture of the use of Section 32 money which is to nullify both mandatory and permissive price supports on perishable commodities such as fruits, vegetables, milk, poultry, and potatoes. Section 32 money has always been the sole source of funds for price supports on most perishables. It is the sole source of funds used to distribute government-owned perishables to public institu-

(more)

tions and school lunch programs, and to divert commodities to industrial uses. Section 32 monies are used to prevent any avoidable waste of commodities acquired by the Department in carrying out price support policies ordered by the Congress. This means that even if other monies were available to support prices of commodities ordinarily supported with Section 32 funds, the government would have no means of preventing waste of perishables it acquired and would thereby face a practical block in its price support work.

In citing this as a period of short production and unusually high prices in which there is no need for Section 32 funds, the committee overlooks the problem we have been having with potatoes, with dried milk and with some fresh vegetables. It overlooks the real possibility of early difficulties with citrus fruit. If raisin producers, for example, should encounter a surplus problem in 1948, the only way they could get help would be through Section 32 funds.

The cotton growers will not overlook the fact that it was Section 32 funds that made it possible to clear the decks of government - owned cotton. The export subsidies for cotton from Section 32 funds have totaled more than 111 million dollars in addition to nearly 40 million dollars in export subsidies paid out of CCC funds. But to offset this cost, the government made a profit of more than 190 million dollars on cotton. And what is more important, growers do not now have to fear the price-depressing effects of a surplus hanging over the market. The cotton export program really did a job and is one example of the effectiveness of the use of Section 32 funds.

The Department has a good record of turning back Section 32 funds not required for current operations. The total turned back is $280,000,000. I therefore see no reason for the Committee to make the determination that the funds should not be available simply because they might not all be needed.

The Committee's action on the Farmers' Home Administration severs any hope that many veterans had, or that many tenant families had, of becoming farm owners in the year ahead. It strikes out farm tenancy loans and cites inflated land

values as the reason despite the fact that land purchased by borrowers under this program averages only $3 per farm more than a year ago. All these loans are made on the basis of long-time earning capacity of the land. In the light of the repayment record on these loans we regard it as a false economy to wipe out these self-liquidating loans.

The bill also reduces by one-third our estimate of 90 million dollars for production and subsistence loans on the grounds that plenty of bank credit is available. No production and subsistence loans are made to farmers who can obtain suitable credit from banks or other proper sources. The needs of veterans are forgotten in the bill as are the many small farmers who still have low incomes while agriculture generally is prospering. The loans to them are largely self-liquidating.

The bill cuts the school lunch funds down from the 75 million dollars originally authorized this year to 45 million despite the recent action of Congress in providing in the second deficiency bill funds to go beyond the 75 million appropriation for the current fiscal year. Such a cut is not consistent with the action of the whole Congress.

There are many additional items of doubtful economy but I must protest at once these cuts. This is not a controversy between the committee and the Secretary of Agriculture. Rather it is between the Appropriations Committee of the House and the often expressed will of the Congress itself. I feel that the Congress will continue its bipartisan support of established farm programs.

- - - -

[FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

**NOTICE.—This report is given out subject to release when consideration of the bill that accompanies it has been completed by the whole committee. Please check on such action before release in order to be advised of any changes.**

80TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 450

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

MAY 23, 1947.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. ——]

The Committee on Appropriations presents herewith the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in the Budget on pages 257 to 380, and in House Documents Nos. 186 and 214 of the present session.

The bill as reported represents an over-all reduction of $337,842,786 below the over-all budget estimate of $1,188,571,318. It is below the over-all total for 1947 of $1,274,686,051 by the sum of $423,957,519. The sums referred to include direct appropriations, reappropriations (in 1947 only), loan authorizations, and the transfer and proposed transfers of funds of money from section 32 funds, being 30 percent of the customs receipts. The bill provides direct appropriations of $615,298,822 which is $189,842,786 below the budget estimate. Added to the reduction just indicated is $148,000,000 of the permanent appropriation under section 32, which the committee has rescinded in title III of the bill, makes a total reduction in annual and permanent appropriations, through action on this bill, of $337,842,786.

61462—47——1

The increases and decreases above referred to are set out in the following statement:

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Direct appropriations | $660, 249, 211 | $805, 141, 608 | $615, 298, 822 | −$44, 950, 389 | −$189, 842, 786 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | | | −133, 784, 292 | |
| Loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −145, 000, 000 | |
| Transfer of funds from permanent appropriations | 75, 000, 000 | 100, 003, 000 | | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds | [8, 760, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [ ] |
| Grand total, excluding net permanent appropriations | 1, 239, 033, 503 | 1, 130, 141, 608 | 840, 298, 822 | −398, 734, 681 | −289, 842, 786 |
| Add net total for permanent appropriations shown in table of permanent appropriations (p. 66) | 52, 747, 348 | 58, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −42, 317, 638 | −48, 000, 000 |
| Grand total, including permanents | 1, 291, 780, 851 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 850, 728, 532 | −441, 052, 319 | −337, 842, 786 |
| Deduct transfers authorized to be made between existing appropriations to meet pay costs under Public Law 390, 79th Cong | −17, 094, 800 | | | −17, 094, 800 | |
| Grand total (net) | 1, 274, 686, 051 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 850, 728, 532 | −423, 957, 519 | −337, 842, 786 |

Detailed tables of the several classes referred to in the above summary may be found on pages 48 to 68. At the end of this report there will also be found a table of the trust funds which will amount, in 1948, to $19,892,100.

## UNUSUAL INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1948

Never, within the recollection of the members of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations, has there been such interest in the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. Doubtless, there are many reasons. Since the termination of World War II, there has been speculation concerning the condition of agriculture in the postwar period, and the possibility of inheriting a surplus problem similar to that which obtained after World War I, in the early twenties and again in the early thirties. To be sure, there is always present that never-ending interest in the products of the soil on the part of the many agricultural constituencies which are represented in the House, and it is only natural that this annual supply bill should beget a broader interest than any other appropriation measure coming before the House.

In a single day, during the deliberations of the subcommittee, 116 witnesses, of whom 71 were Members of the House of Representatives, presented themselves to testify on some phase of this bill. An aggregate of departmental, congressional, and outside witnesses would easily total 500 persons. There was a disposition on the part of the committee to hear every witness in order that a complete record might be made. Consideration of the bill up to the time when the report was completed and the bill presented to the whole Committee on Appropriations covered a period of more than 8 weeks, and should serve as persuasive evidence to the country of the amount of work that goes into the preparation of a measure of this kind.

*Back to primary sources*

It is quite clear from the testimony which the committee received from all sources that there is today a new emphasis in agriculture. The accent is on research. It has become almost a household word in the whole domain of agriculture and is a healthy indication that, more and more, farmers and those identified with farm policy are becoming increasingly interested in what is commonly called the know-how of agriculture.

It is of more than passing interest that this new accent is like a revival of the sentiment which impelled the creation of this Department of Government. On May 15, 1862, the bill which established a Department of Agriculture in the Federal Government was signed by President Abraham Lincoln, and the 15th of May 1947 marked the eighty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the Department.

It is therefore meet and proper that the language of the original act be quoted here to indicate the reasons for the creation of the Department. That act recites in part, that:

> There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

The act goes on to define the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture and recites in part, that:

> The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence, and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power; he shall collect new and valuable seeds and plants, shall test, by cultivation, the value of such of them as may require such tests; shall propagate such as may be worthy of propagation; and shall distribute them among the agriculturists.

It must be obvious that the purpose of a Department of Agriculture was the conduct of research and the diffusion of its fruits among the farmers of the Nation. After the elapse of four score and five years it is interesting to note that once more the emphasis is on research and know-how, rather than upon action programs which may constitute an undue burden upon the Federal Treasury.

## GROWTH

We have come far since President Lincoln signed that bill in 1862. Like every agency of Government, the Department of Agriculture

was then quite small and the appropriations so modest that they would have caused scarcely any comment in this day when Congress and the country deal with astronomical sums. The growth and size of the Department today can be estimated from certain physical factors such as the space occupied and the number of personnel. In 1946 the Department occupied 1,458,482 square feet in Federal buildings in the District of Columbia, 68,451 square feet of rented space in the District of Columbia, 2,097,373 square feet in Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia, and 3,510,459 square feet of rented space outside the District of Columbia. It therefore occupies an aggregate of 7,134,765 square feet of office space, or a total of approximately 170 acres, in all parts of the country. This would doubtless exceed the fondest dreams that its creator ever entertained.

*General evaluation of the work*

The Department of Agriculture concerns itself with every function and activity which is of interest to the farmer and to a stable agriculture. It begins with the soil and the conservation of that soil as a natural resource which we hold in trust for future generations. It deals with the seed and the plants which go into the soil and which embody our hopes for a continued subsistence. It interests itself in farm buildings and more useful and convenient living for farm families and the housing of livestock and machinery. It encompasses the electrification of the farm and its beautification as an incentive for keeping young people on the land. Its activities follow the produce of the farm to the market where they are devoted to better distribution, to a better dissemination of information on prices and markets, and to a better knowledge of grading. It evidences an interest in both the domestic and foreign markets for the farmer's produce and for an expansion of those markets through diversion programs and new uses. It is obviously interested in the price which a farmer receives and concerns itself with economic devices, such as loans and price supports, in the interest of price stability and the equality of purchasing power for the farmer. Finally, it concerns itself also about farm credit, whether it be for conducting farm operations or for the purchase of a farm. All these come within the purview of the Department of Agriculture.

## WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

In appraising the needs of the Department for the next fiscal year and in orienting itself to the needs of agriculture for other years which lie ahead, the committee has given more and more attention and discussion to the question of Federal responsibility for agriculture and to what extent that responsibility should be borne by the Federal Government. It can scarcely be contended that the various States, most of which have comfortable bank balances as distinguished from the Federal Government with a $268,000,000,000 debt, and which derive profit and taxes from our farm domain and from farmers' incomes, do not have a stake in farmers' achievements and in the progress of agriculture.

Members of the committee, like all other Members of Congress, have carefully pondered the road down which agriculture shall travel. Shall it at long last be the paternalistic road along which there are subsidies and grants coupled with more and more direction from

Washington or shall we move back, in some degree at least, to the road set forth in the act signed by Abraham Lincoln, along which one may find the bench marks of research, the diffusion of useful know-l edge, improved market news, the necessary supports and loans, and a larger degree of reliance upon the individual farmer. As we give thought to such a problem as soil conservation and to the saving of the surface of our land from the influences of erosion, we also have the responsibility of pursuing those policies that will prevent the erosion of that rugged individual character which has made the American farmer the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in any time or generation in the world's history.

## THE COMMITTEE APPROACH

When all is said and done the appropriation of funds must be geared to some kind of a basic philosophy.

The committee could follow the route of indiscriminate reductions for the purpose of effecting substantial economies but such a course might result in the serious crippling of essential functions or in nullifying the remainder of the appropriation carried for such an activity. On the other hand, the committee can follow a basic approach which preserves the essential functions, eliminates those which are not regarded as indispensable, and reduces waste, extravagance, and duplication with constant emphasis upon those research activities which in the judgment of the committee are regarded as essential.

Sometimes the elimination of a single man from a scientific bureau can destroy an essential step in an entire chain of scientific endeavor and thereby make the rest of the work fruitless or abortive or place it in a status which will only delay the ultimate result.

Many views were expressed by various witnesses to the effect that the farmer could not and would not do for himself some of those essential things which cannot be immediately measured in terms of cash. With this view the committee does not agree because it has too much confidence in the self-reliance and capacity of the American farmer.

The question of duplication was often in evidence and many protests concerning duplication of activities and facilities have come to the committee from time to time. The need for eliminating duplication was so well summed up by one farm leader who said in effect "Congress wouldn't think of having one rural carrier to deliver first-class mail, another rural carrier to deliver second-class mail and still a third rural carrier to deliver third-class mail over the same route." This was his way of expressing the need for consolidation of functions in the interest of a more efficient operation.

It was refreshing also to hear witness after witness reaffirm and reassert his interest in the need for economy. It was so well put by an humble but vigorous farm leader from Minnesota, who said in effect "We do not ask more money for soil conservation. We merely ask for more conservation for the same money." The committee, therefore, in its final deliberations on this bill followed the spirit of a phrase which is in common use in the Forestry Service. The foresters speak of "selective logging." The committee has endeavored in its consideration of this bill to effectuate "selective reductions" based upon the present condition of agriculture and the needs of the future.

## CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE

Every Member of Congress should read carefully the very excellent statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on the general condition of agriculture as a whole. It is a splendid report and evidences a condition never attained by agriculture in any country in any time or generation.

In that statement the Secretary points out that our farm domain was at the very pinnacle of production in 1946 with the greatest production in history. Between 1940 and 1946, the value of assets used in agriculture had increased from 53.7 billion to 101.6 billion, which is an increase of 89 percent in that period. The increase in the proprietor's equity in agriculture increased by 49.5 billion dollars or 113 percent. The value of cash and bonds in the hands of farmers jumped from 4.2 billion to 19 billion while on the other hand farmers' debts dropped from 10 billion to 8.3 billion. The value of farmers' livestock, equipment and inventories had increased by 63 percent and the value of farm lands by 68 percent. Here then, is unparalleled testimony to the splendid conditions of American agriculture.

## THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

Doubtless, this information was before the President when he compiled and presented his budget message to Congress on January 10, 1947. The President's observations are quite worthy of repetition. The President said, in part, referring to soil-conservation payments:

> A year ago the budget message recommended gradual reduction of these payments and that recommendation is now renewed. More than 60 percent of the total payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. Most of this money, thus, is being paid to a comparatively small number of farmers, who, because of their strong position in American agriculture would undoubtedly continue the best farm-management practices without the persuasion of a bonus from the Treasury.
>
> We should shift our effort from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service. I therefore propose that the appropriation act limit the conservation and use program for the crop year 1948 to $200,000,000 instead of the $300,000,000 program to which we are committed for the crop year 1947. This will not affect expenditures materially until the fiscal year 1949.

While the committee does not agree with the President concerning commitments in the crop year 1947, it cites this expression from the President to indicate that the Chief Executive has had in mind a shift of emphasis from subsidies to technical guidance on the ground that many farmers are in a strong position to continue sound farm practices without a bonus from the Federal Treasury.

This logic is in substantial accord with the viewpoint followed by the subcommittee in determining the various needs of agriculture for the fiscal year 1948. (See p. 23, post, for discussion of committee's action on the President's recommendation.)

## EXTENSION SERVICE

While the estimates for the Extension Service for the fiscal year 1948 total $23,660,150, only $827,200 of this estimated amount is for administrative expenses, the balance is distributed among the States

under various acts of Congress which go back to 1914 and are used at the State level.

In addition, the States participate in matching these funds to the extent of $25,669,716, so that the total funds available for this function from all sources will be $52,992,540.

It was at this point that the committee engaged in a long and earnest discussion concerning the duplication of many field activities of the Department and hoped to contrive a policy or a vehicle whereby these functions might be consolidated. The general limitations on an appropriation bill, however, stood in the way and the committee respectfully suggests to the Legislative Committee on Agriculture for the House of Representatives that this matter deserves immediate attention.

At the present time the Extension Service has on its rolls 10,419 persons consisting of State supervisors, specialists, county agents, home demonstration agents, boys' club agents, clerks and assistants, virtually all of whom operate at the field level and maintain close contact with farmers in disseminating the research fruits and the recommended practices of the Department.

At the same time the Soil Conservation Service in its field operation maintains 7 regional offices with 860 persons, 50 State offices with 419 persons, 550 district offices with 1,000 persons, and 2,268 work unit offices with 9,350 persons.

To this large field operation there must be added the Farmers Home Administration with a total of —— persons operating at area, district, and county levels. It appears reasonably clear that there is both administrative and functional duplication in the field between these agencies and immediate steps should be taken to develop programs at county levels under unified management whereby substantial additional economies might be effected. The Extension Service was, therefore, left intact without a reduction.

## FOREST SERVICE

For fiscal 1948 there was an over-all estimate for the Forest Service of $66,145,500. It has become a vast domain of activity but that observation is not intended to convey the impression that forestry is not important. As a matter of fact, more and more, forestry is coming to be regarded as an annual crop with definite cash income benefits to farmers in all sections of the country. There is a growing interest in forestry as evidenced by the fact that more than threescore witnesses appeared to testify on one item or another in the Forest Service estimate.

The committee points out first of all that there has been no substantial increase in the acreage of the national forests since 1938.

There has been an undue emphasis on public relations by the Forest Service as evidenced by the fact that 114 persons are employed in informational and educational activities. Some of the projects for which funds were requested appeared highly nebulous in character and in some cases the work appeared to be rather academic.

On those items in which there was such broad public interest and for which there appear to be genuine justification, such as forest-fire cooperation and farm-forestry cooperation, the committee made no reductions. Nor did it reduce many of the field and research functions

which the Forestry Service presently pursues. It does, however, believe that the reductions which are tabulated below are fully justified and that there will be no impairment of the usefulness and the efficiency of the Forest Service.

### PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLICITY ACTIVITIES

It was reported to the committee by the Department that a total of approximately 500 persons were devoting approximately 340 man-years of work to "public relations and publicity activities."

The Department contends that all of such work is in connection with the "diffusion among the people of the United States of useful information on subjects connected with agriculture," as authorized in the basic act of 1862. Be that as it may, the word "useful" is a highly relative term. The members of the committee, as well as Members of the House generally, are constantly coming across publications and releases whose "usefulness" in connection with agriculture is of questionable degree. Many recipients of such publications or releases have mailed them to the committee or to Members of the House deploring the waste of public funds in their preparation and mailing.

It had been the purpose of the committee to reduce to 250 man-years the amount of work permitted to be done under this head during the fiscal year 1948. However, it was found all but impossible to draft a provision in such terms as would not endanger the fundamental work of the Department in diffusing essential information pertaining to agriculture. The committee believes it is a matter which can be controlled by the more flexible device of administrative regulation, without injury to agriculture, and has decided to give the Department the opportunity to "reform itself." It is believed that under a purposeful and rigid supervision which will prescribe essentiality and a high degree of unquestionable "usefulness to agriculture" for all publicity and public relations activities, the Department should be able to achieve the purpose of the committee in effecting the reduction above indicated. Its success in so doing will be measured by the committee next year when it will call for a report of such activities or 1948, to be compared with the report submitted this session.

### DEPARTMENT BUREAU AND BUDGET BUREAU ESTIMATES

On page 197 of the hearings it will be observed that the total of all estimates presented to the Department by the various bureaus in the Department for the fiscal year 1948 was $1,611,961,683. These estimates were then canvassed by the departmental staff and reduced to $1,448,757,528. This then was the estimate presented to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget in turn thereupon recanvassed these estimates and finally reduced them to $1,198,571,318. These figures would indicate that by action of the Budget Bureau the estimates as originally submitted by the component agencies in the Department of Agriculture were reduced by more than $400,000,000 before they were presented to the Congress.

There follow somewhat more detailed discussions of the committee's action on the several budget requests.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Salaries.*—In view of the substantial reductions made in the many action-program appropriations carried in the bill, the committee feels that the work of the Office of the Secretary will be substantially reduced. The budget estimate involves an increase of $118,350. Certain items among those increases have been approved by the committee as follows: Replacement of the official automobile for the use of the Secretary, $3,000; for the establishment of a health program for employees under the act of August 8, 1946, $45,000; and within-grade salary advancements, $26,850. The committee has made a reduction of $100,000 in the budget of $2,150,000 for this item in the belief that the increases above referred to can be provided for through administrative adjustments of the remaining objects of expenditure.

*Penalty mail.*—The budget estimate for penalty mail is in the sum of $3,686,000, which the committee has reduced by $500,000. Elsewhere in the bill the committee has eliminated the agricultural conservation payment program for 1948. The penalty mail allotment to the Production and Marketing Administration from this appropriation is in the sum of $1,746,491, of which $938,000 is estimated for use in connection with that program. It is obvious that the major portion of the latter sum would be expended in connection with planning and carrying out the program for 1948 and since that has been eliminated, the committee believes a cut of $500,000 in the penalty mail estimate can be made with entire safety.

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The budget includes an estimate of $19,000,000 for carrying into effect the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946, otherwise known as the Research and Marketing Act, or the Hope-Flannagan Act. The committee held exhaustive hearings with departmental witnesses on this estimate as well as from a large number of individuals and organizations. Since this is the first year of a very far-reaching program which is contemplated to increase in appropriations after 5 years to the level of approximately $61,000,000, the committee believes the launching of the program should be approached in the light of all research already being done that has a direct or indirect influence on marketing. It is to be noted, also, that the department itself does not, as yet, have a well-developed program embracing the appropriations requested, nor following the recommendations of the legislative committee's report of 1946.

The committee has been somewhat more liberal with respect to the amounts to be allotted to the land-grant colleges than with the other divisions of the program. As against a budget estimate of $5,000,000 for payments to the State experiment stations, the bill provides $3,000,000. For the remaining three projects under the act, the bill provides $1,000,000 for each, a total appropriation for the initial year of the act, of $6,000,000. The committee was impressed with the evidence given as to the importance and value of the Research and Marketing Act program, but believes that such a program should be clear of any charge of duplication and should reflect research truly in the direction of increasing the flow of agriculture products in com-

merce by projects designed to increase consumption. The Congress obviously contemplated an independent merchandising program, not a supplementary appendix to an existing production research program.

### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The budget estimate of $2,525,000 for the Office of the Solicitor has been reduced in the sum of $100,000. In view of the many substantial reductions in the program items throughout the bill which require the services of the Solicitor's office, the committee believes that it can function efficiently under the reduced expenditure and at the same time make the necessary within-grade salary promotions. The committee is of the opinion that an overhauling of the organizational set-up in the Solicitor's office whereby more legal talent can be devoted to actual legal work rather than supervision could effectuate additional economies in this office.

### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The budget estimate of $700,000 for salaries and expenses represents an increase of $38,950 over the appropriations for the current year. Of this increase, $10,950 is for within-grade salary advancements; $20,000 is for additional work in answering public and congressional requests for information; and $8,000 is for an increase in the accounting and auditing staff. It is in this office that much of the Department's publicity work is carried on. In applying the recommended reduction of $125,000 in this item, the Department will, of course, have in mind the considerations discussed above under the caption, "Public relations and publicity activities."

*Printing and binding.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,607,000 for printing and binding, which is an increase of $296,400 above the current appropriation. This increase is occasioned primarily by the recent advance in the cost of printing. It was reported to the committee that the purchasing power of the printing and binding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 and as proposed for 1948, is less than half that in any of the three fiscal years, 1940–42. These are factors beyond the control of the committee or of the Department, and the committee was unable to justify any reduction.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The committee has allowed the budget estimate of $2,375,400 for crop and livestock estimates, which is but $50 less than the estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1947. The committee believes the importance of the crop and livestock estimates cannot be overstressed. Economic investigations, to the contrary, do not enjoy the same confidence and esteem of the committee. It is believed that much of the work in the field of economic investigations is highly speculative in nature, economics being one of the least precise of the sciences, if, indeed, it may be dignified by that term. It is believed that the program of economic investigations may be drastically curtailed without any injury to the work of the Department, if the objectives of such investigations are carefully determined and made specifically applicable to work of the Department requiring such investigations. One

of the activities of the Department toward which the committee believes the studies of this agency should be directed is that of the new research and marketing program, the initial appropriation for which is being made in this bill. The committee has reduced the budget estimate of $2,493,600 in the sum of $750,000 and feels sure that in doing so it has not imposed any real injury upon agriculture. The committee was well impressed with the sincerity and the ability of the head of this office, namely, Mr. O. V. Wells, and appreciates his assurance given to the committee that he would endeavor to carry on the program within whatever sum the Congress shall appropriate.

### OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The budget estimate of $728,000, which is the amount available for the current year, has been cut in the sum of $100,000. As in the case of economic investigations, this activity occupies a field of somewhat indefinite boundaries. The committee feels sure that the work can be carried on under the reduced amount without injury to agriculture and it also believes that this appropriation is one where the work should be oriented toward the newly established marketing and research program. The committee was disposed to make a larger reduction in this amount and refrained from doing so only because of the possibility that foreign outlets for agricultural commodities may require additional emphasis in the fiscal year 1948.

### RESEARCH

In the research bureaus under the general administrative head of the Agricultural Research Administration, reductions were made in some of these projects on the ground that many of them had been in process for a good many years and should be terminated or brought to completion. The committee was of the opinion that some of the scientific talent in these Bureaus was scattered pretty thinly and that better results could be obtained by reducing the number of lines of work and concentrating upon certain selective activities that appeared of greater importance to agriculture as a whole. These reductions are in nowise intended to cripple scientific work but rather to concentrate it along the most useful lines in the interest of more expeditious results.

### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

*Office of the Administrator.*—Several years ago, the Secretary, by administrative order, established the Agricultural Research Administration, with an administrator, and staff, under whose supervision and direction the following research activities were grouped: Special Research Fund, Office of Experiment Stations, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Dairy Industry, Bureau of Plant Industry, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, and the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. Under a recent administrative order, all other research activities of the Department have been brought under the supervision and control of the Office of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration. These include the research activities of the Forest Service, those of the Soil Conservation Service, and will

also include the Research on Strategic and Critical Materials, which is provided for elsewhere in the bill. In addition to the supervision of research, the Office of the Administrator controls and operates the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md. The center occupies an area of approximately 15,000 acres, of which 2,500 acres is used by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The value of the remaining acreage and the structures is estimated at about $13,000,000. The custodial function relating to the center is under the Office of the Administrator. This includes, of course, the care and maintenance of buildings, roadways, heating and lighting and the other usual custodial services. The several research bureaus of the Department carry on much of their basic fundamental research at the center up to the point where the application of the research in the various geographical sections of the country become operative and the work is then suitably allotted to the various regions. It is quite obvious that increased costs of labor by virtue of the 40-hour week and increased cost for feed and supplies has materially increased the operating cost of the research center at Beltsville and these additional costs must be taken into account.

### SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND

The budget estimate, $1,300,000, for the special research fund is in the amount of the current appropriation. Here the committee has imposed a cut of $100,000, which is to be applied to the special projects carried on by designation of the Secretary and not to the special research laboratories in the major agricultural regions. The committee believes that the program under this fund should also be oriented to the new activity under the research and marketing appropriation.

### STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The committee has provided the full amount of the budget estimate of $349,000 for the project authorized by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946, as such act may relate to natural rubber. Exhaustive hearings were held on this activity at which the committee heard witnesses from the Army and Navy Munitions Board respecting the military importance of this research as well as from the representatives of the Department of Agriculture under which the experiments relating to rubber production are to be carried on. The budget estimate breaks down into two separate parts under which $170,000 is to be spent for investigations to develop domestic sources of natural rubber from guayule and other rubber plants and $179,000 for investigations of improved methods for extracting and processing rubber from such plants. In view of the high security rating of this item and of the character of the testimony supporting it, the committee felt it would not be justified in making any reduction under the budget estimate and has therefore provided the full amount.

### RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

The bill carries this year, for the first time, a special appropriation for research on agricultural problems of Alaska. This Territory has come to occupy a very important place in the national establishment.

It is now, and may for some time continue to be, an important link in the chain of our national security.

The committee had the benefit of the testimony of witnesses representing the Secretary of War. They reported that the Army procurements of the products of Alaska farms amount to but 6.35 percent of the Army's total procurements, for use in Alaska, of the same products. Such commodities, when obtained from the States or other outside points are laid down in Alaska at materially increased costs and with appreciable losses in the nutritional quality of many of the products. These factors seriously affect the well-being of the military personnel, and in the case of a great national emergency might well constitute a disastrous defect in logistics. The committee believes that the importance of the availability of locally produced food and feed supplies for any military force is obvious.

It is reliably reported to the committee that a very substantial number of veterans have already gone to Alaska and that many more will do so in the years immediately ahead. Most of these have gone to Alaska with the view of taking up farming. They will need the guidance which can be supplied only as the result of careful research.

The group of Department of Agriculture research scientists which this committee sent to Alaska last summer for the purpose of a reconnaissance survey of the need for agricultural research in that Territory has submitted what is probably the most comprehensive report ever made (see hearings, pp. 1833 et seq.) of the possibilities of Alaska agriculture and the many complex problems relating thereto.

The committee is impressed with the importance of a program of agricultural research in that Territory of far greater scope than has heretofore been conducted under the comparatively modest Federal grants to the Territorial land-grant college. It is the firm conviction of the committee that the national aspects of this problem indicate that, for some years ahead, all agricultural research in the Territory should be carried on as a single integrated program under the sole administration and authority of the Federal Secretary of Agriculture, who is directly responsible to the Congress. The problem presented is of such grave national import that the integration suggested above becomes an imperative necessity.

To that end, the bill includes a single appropriaton of $144,940 for research on agricultural problems of Alaska (see p. 18 of the bill). This sum includes the amounts which otherwise would have been appropriated for the Territorial experiment station under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts. In addition, there is being made available the allotment to which the Territory would be entitled under the appropriation to carry out the Research and Marketing Act, approximating $12,000. The bill provides that the Territorial appropriations for the experiment station, together with all lands, buildings, equipment, and products now under the control of the station, shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture and by him used to carry out the program. Should the sale of products, the receipts from which are returned to the appropriation, equal that of several recent years, the total of funds available for this work in 1948 will be somewhat in excess of $200,000—more than double what it has been heretofore.

The Secretary of Agriculture will take over the station with a view to continuing, so far as consonant with the over-all integrated pro-

gram, the several lines of research in existence at the time of taking over. He will so plan and conduct the program provided for in the accompanying bill as to embrace, among others, projects suitable for carrying on under the regular land-grant college appropriations authorized by the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts; so that when the operation of the station is returned to the university, there will be possible an uninterrupted continuity of land-grant college research. The Secretary, during the period of his operations, will preserve and continue such mutually beneficial relations between the station and the university, such as the cooperative exchange of personnel and other facilities, as, in his judgment, will facilitate the development of a strong research program. In the sale of farm products resulting from research, he will give the university priority of opportunity to purchase, and upon terms deemed by him fair and reasonable in the premises.

It is expected that the Territory of Alaska will continue to make appropriations for the prosecution of the integrated program under the Federal management set up in the bill to the same extent such appropriations would be made under Territorial management of the station.

It is contemplated that the time will come when the Congress will determine that its interest in and responsibility for agricultural research in Alaska may be adequately discharged through the making of annual grants under the acts above referred to, at which time the program will revert to its former status of control and administration by the University of Alaska, and all lands, buildings, equipment, machinery, livestock, and products used in such research will revert to their original status.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1934, agricultural research in Alaska has been carried on exclusively by the Territorial experiment station under the University of Alaska from grants made to such station under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts, together with funds which have been appropriated by the Territorial Legislature. Including the annual Federal appropriation of $15,000, first made for the fiscal year 1931, the total of funds available for work by the experiment station from 1931 up to and including the fiscal year 1945 is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal appropriations | $343, 641. 50 |
| Territorial appropriations | 62, 000. 00 |
| Proceeds from sale of products | 168, 599. 20 |
| Total | 574, 240. 70 |

Previous to the time covered in the foregoing table, the Federal Department of Agriculture had for many years conducted agricultural research in a small way at various points in Alaska. In the appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, appropriations for Federal operation of research in Alaska were discontinued. Under the authority contained in said act, which was reported out by this committee, the Secretary of Agriculture transferred to the University of Alaska title to the lands comprising the experiment station, together with the buildings thereon. It is these lands, originally belonging to the Government and later donated to the Territory of Alaska, plus such lands, if any, which may since have been added thereto, which the accompanying bill makes

available for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the emergency program of research provided for in the bill.

It is not the purpose of the bill to divest the university or the experiment station of the title to the lands or other properties which are to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture. When the time, referred to above, arrives that the Congress shall deem its responsibility for agricultural research in Alaska will be adequately discharged through the regular Federal grants to the Territorial university, the Federal administration of the program will be withdrawn and that of the university authorities will be restored. It is the opinion of the committee that the station will then be returned to normal Territorial operation as a vastly improved set-up, which will redound greatly to the benefit of Alaskan agriculture and to the enhancement of the prestige of the university and the experiment station.

## OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

The budget estimate of $7,206,208 for payments to States and Territories is in the same amount as for the current fiscal year. The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate with the exception of $44,940, which is estimated for payment to Alaska. This amount has been included in the total appropriated for research on agricultural problems of Alaska heretofore mentioned (see immediately above). The budget estimate of $211,000 for administration of grants and coordination of research with States has been allowed. This represents an increase of $17,000 above the 1947 appropriation, of which $14,000 is to enable the office to overcome a backlog in publications work and $3,000 is on account of within-grade salary advancements.

*Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico.*—The committee has allowed the budget estimate of $114,700, which is a decrease of $62,500 represented by a nonrecurring item included in the act for last year to cover the cost of construction of improvements at the station.

## BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

The following budget estimates have been approved, namely: Animal husbandry, $1,305,500, an increase of $169,000 above the current appropriation; diseases of animals, $1,045,000, representing an increase of $45,000 over 1947, and eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease, $6,750,000, the amount of the current appropriation. The budget estimate of $1,340,000 for Inspection and Quarantine has been cut in the sum of $114,803, of which $81,806 is applicable to the project for control of interstate shipment of livestock for the purpose of preventing the spread of communicable diseases and $32,997 to the project for supervision of the importation of hides, forage, etc. The budget estimate of $340,000 for the Virus Serum Toxin Act has been reduced in the sum of $50,000. In the view of the committee, the various serums have become fairly well standardized and do not now require the measure of supervision and control as formerly.

*Meat inspection.*—The budget carries an estimate of $11,140,000 for meat inspection, which is an increase of $740,000 above 1947, of which $240,000 is for within-grade salary advancements and $500,000 is for additional veterinarians and lay inspectors. The dispersion of the

meat-packing industry to many smaller plants in outlying cities and towns has in recent years occasioned the necessity for increases in the number of veterinarians and lay inspectors. In view of the fact that similar inspection service which has for a number of years been provided to plants packing seafood products is now being paid for in full by the packers and since it has long been believed that the cost of meat inspection should be borne by the product through the assessment of fees against the packers measured by the amount and the cost of services received, the committee has included legislation which will require hereafter that the packers of meat products pay fees in amounts requisite to cover the cost of the service rendered and has established and appropriated a revolving fund of $5,000,000, which is a reduction of $6,140,000 under the budget estimate. If the committee's recommendations receive the approval of the Congress, the meat inspection appropriation will disappear from the bill and the annual pressure for increasing this appropriation to meet the increasing needs will no longer be present for the reason that such increasing needs will automatically be cared for through the increased fees collected.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

The budget estimate of $1,136,000 which is an increase of $142,188 above the current appropriation has been reduced in the sum of $125,000 to be applied as follows: To the investigations of the influence of breeding, feeding, and management practices on efficiency of production, $75,000; to the investigations of the nutritional and other physiological factors affecting the usefulness of dairy cattle, $25,000, and to the investigations of milk and milk products, $25,000.

### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

The committee has approved the budget estimate of $2,784,000, an increase of $120,700 above the current amount for investigations of field crops, and has also approved the budget estimate of $2,445,000, an increase above the current amount of $199,700, for investigations of fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops.

*Forest diseases.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $440,000 for forest diseases with the exception of $80,720 allotted for work on diseases of young natural stands and plantings (including white pine blister rust, chestnut blight, and rust of southern pines).

*Agricultural engineering.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $637,000. This includes a decrease of $37,300 by reason of a nonrecurring 1947 item for repair of the physical facilities at field stations and an increase in the same amount of which $30,000 is for increased field labor costs and $7,300 for within-grade salary advancements.

*National Arboretum.*—The budget includes $761,000 for the National Arboretum, which is an increase of $675,100 above the current appropriation. The committee has allowed $350,000 of this increase for the purchase of six tracts of land needed for an entranceway and to round out the natural boundaries of the Arboretum, and $1,000 for within-grade salary promotions. The options for the purchase of these tracts will expire July 31. If not taken up now they cannot be secured

subsequently except at very great advanced cost. The remaining increases relating to the preparation of plans for a development program, the construction of needed roads and the installation of utility systems have been disallowed.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

*Insect investigations.*—The budget estimate for insect investigations is in the sum of $3,150,000, which represents an increase of $200,500 above 1947. Without reference to the several items of increase submitted in the budget, the committee has made a total reduction of $188,700 as follows: The budget estimate of $182,100 for insects affecting man and animals has been cut back to $100,000; the estimate of $158,200 for identification and classification of insects has been cut back to $100,000; and the estimate of $222,900 has been cut back to $175,000.

*Insect and plant-disease control.*—The budget estimate for insect and plant disease control is $3,467,000, which is an increase of $115,400 above the current appropriation. The action by the committee on this item is as follows: It has eliminated entirely the allotments for Dutch elm disease control with the exception of $51,800 for work to determine action to be taken by cooperating agencies to protect elm trees in areas of general infection. The items eliminated are: Identification of infected trees $27,700; quarantine enforcement $42,400, and surveys to determine the areas where the disease occurs as a basis for quarantine enforcement $119,800, making, in all, a total reduction of $269,900 under the Dutch elm project. The testimony presented to the committee was to the effect that State contributions for this work are falling off, evidencing a diminishing hope for ultimate control of this disease. The item for pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control for which the budget allotment is $999,000, has been reduced in the sum of $500,000. The committee reduction includes complete elimination of work in wild cotton in Florida with discretion left to the Department to apply the remaining portion of the cut among the several projects.

*Foreign plant quarantines.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $2,000,000 for foreign plant quarantines, which represents an increase of $258,000 over 1947. This increase is due primarily to the increasing number of airplane arrivals from foreign points, particularly from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which constitute serious danger areas. The committee believes that it would be proper for the cost of these quarantine inspections to be met from fees collected from the air lines or other carriers bringing passengers or cargo from any foreign point necessitating the quarantine and inspection measures appropriated for under this item. It is expected the Department will give some study to this plan during the coming year with a view of reporting its recommendations with respect thereto in connection with the 1949 budget.

*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.*—The budget has estimated for this item the same amount as was provided for 1947, namely, $2,800,000. This is primarily an emergency item and the total amount needed and the several subamounts for the various potential insect emergencies is largely a matter of speculation. As a result the budget break-down shows a total of $1,382,500 reserved

for allotment. The budget allotments include, for the white fringed beetle control, $848,500; for pear psylla control, $495,000; and for Hall scale eradication, $74,000, the balance of the fund being unallotted. Advices received by the committee indicate the allotment for pear psylla control can be reduced in the sum of $250,000. The committee has made such reduction together with an additional reduction of $500,000 from the unallotted portion, or a total reduction for the item of $750,000, leaving an appropriation of $2,080,000.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

The budget estimate of $5,664,050 for all activities under the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry is in the same amount as for the current fiscal year with the exception of one increase of $80,000 under the regional research laboratories for within-grade salary advancements. The committee was impressed with the excellence of the work performed and the importance of the results attained by the researches carried on under this bureau. It has approved the full amount of the budget estimate for each of the several items.

### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,045,000 for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. This represents an increase of $25,000 for the preparation of materials to promote the prompt dissemination and the application of results of timely scientific investigations in human nutrition and home economics. The committee is impressed with the achievements of this Bureau. Whereas, the total annual expenditures for research under the Department approximate $30,000,000, it is notable that most of the research relates to such items as the breeding and feeding of better hogs and other livestock and breeding and cultural investigations relating to the crops grown in the field, leaving but $1,000,000 for the improvement of the living conditions in the farmer's home where, after all is said and done, it is quite generally agreed, the Nation's greatest crop—that of human beings—is produced. The work of this Bureau seems to be in excellent hands, and it is apparently maintain effective contacts with the women and women's national organizations devoted to the improvement of the American home. The committee had the benefit of the very excellent and convincing testimony of the representatives of the organizations referred to. It should be stated that many of the results of the research by this Bureau redound to the benefit of homes in the city as well as to those on the farm.

### WHITE PINE BLISTER-RUST CONTROL

The budget estimate of $4,000,000 for white pine blister-rust control represents a decrease of $2,000,000 under the amount appropriated for 1947. The committee has approved the budget decrease and has imposed an additional reduction of $250,000 on the project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. It is the belief of the committee that over the years an adequate knowledge of the techniques in the control

of white pine blister rust have been rather fully developed and that the estimated amount for guidance and leadership is extraordinarily large. For this reason it was reduced.

### FLOOD CONTROL

Appropriations for flood control are made available until expended, the result being that for each year's direct appropriation there usually comes over from the former year certain unexpended balances. Intelligent consideration of the funds provided must therefore be on the basis of total funds available rather than on a total appropriated for the respective years. On that basis the amount for flood control for the fiscal year 1947 was $3,500,000 and the amount available for obligation for 1948 is estimated to be $2,500,619. This represents a reduction under the current year of $999,381. The appropriation required to be made and for which a budget estimate has been submitted is $500,000. This amount has been allowed by the committee and is included in the accompanying bill. The carry-over from 1947 amounts to $2,019,619. Of the total funds available, $11,000 will be transferred to "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture," and $8,000 to the Office of the Solicitor, leaving the $2,500,619 above-mentioned available for obligation during the 1948 program. It was disclosed at the hearings that in former years some of the expenditures have not been applied to the particular projects set up in the break-downs presented in the Department's justification notes. The committee disapproves of the practice of indulging in any such departures and expects that hereafter expenditures of unobligated funds, whether appropriated this year or whether carried over from previous fiscal years, shall be in compliance with the project breakdowns presented to the committee.

### FOREST SERVICE

*General administrative expenses.*—The budget estimate of $682,000 for general administrative expenses of the Forest Service has been reduced to $650,000. The committee has the impression that this activity is overstaffed at the top and that the small cut of $32,000 can be applied without injury to the service in the forests themselves. This cut is predicated in part upon the reductions ordered by the committee throughout the Department in public relations and publicity activities. The committee believes that work of this kind is over emphasized in the Forest Service and can well be reduced.

*National forest protection and management.*—This appropriation is for the care and administration of the national domain of forest lands. The budget estimate of $25,310,000 for costs of administration of these lands has been reduced in the total sum of $1,545,109. The project for general management and operation, to which the budget has allowed $7,082,169, has been reduced in the sum of $500,000. A very large percentage of this allotment is represented by office work, which the committee believes is overemphasized. Relatively, the reduction is not very drastic and should not result in any injury to the forests themselves or their maintenance. The budget allotment of $2,675,276 for the maintenance of improvements other than roads and trails has been cut in the sum of $100,000. The forest-fire-control

allotment of $7,154,877 has not been reduced. The committee was much impressed with the testimony of the Chief of the United States Weather Bureau respecting the use of radar in connection with the location and determination of direction of thunderstorms. Since a large percentage of forest fires originate from lightning during thunderstorms, it is believed that the use of radar equipment can be very helpful in reducing the losses from storm-induced forest fires since the warning of the existence and the path of such storms would enable the Forest Service to make preparatory moves to care for the many fires resulting. The Weather Bureau indicated it is installing radar equipment in general agricultural regions, particularly in the Middle West where tornadoes are of frequent occurrence, as rapidly as such equipment can be obtained from Army surplus or other sources. The Weather Bureau is aware of its possibilities where located in forest areas and has in mind the establishment of radar equipment in such areas at an early date. The budget allotment of $3,915,166 for timber and forest products sales has been reduced by $600,000. This reduction, however, is not designed to interfere with the reforestation program. The allotment of $162,813 for the production of wildlife resources in the forests has been eliminated entirely. It is not the purpose of the committee to eliminate the function relating to wildlife resources. It believes, however, that the function can be cared for out of other general items. There is also the possibility of elimination of what the committee believes may be duplication in this field of work now being carried on by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department and similar services of the States. The committee has not reduced the allotment of $1,966,291 for the reforestation and revegetation of denuded forest areas. It wishes to point out, however, that this work very closely parallels similar work now carried on by the Soil Conservation Service and believes the Department should give it careful attention with a view to preventing or eliminating any duplication which may exist.

*Forest and range management investigations.*—The committee has approved the full amount of the budget allotment of $1,309,461 for experimental forests and ranges. This will provide for the continued operation of the service experimental stations, many of which were established under last year's allotment, which was approximately three times the allotment for this purpose for the fiscal year 1946. The committee has not deemed it wise to further expand this program of establishing experimental forests at this time and has confined itself to providing the necessary amount to continue those stations already in operation. The committee has reduced the budget allotment of $762,731, for forest management, by $200,000. The committee has been impressed with the repeated references over the years to the forests as one of the Nation's most important agricultural crops. Last year and again this year the committee has had tables inserted in the record (see pp. 99–100 of pt. 2 of the hearings) showing the disproportionately small percentage of State experiment stations' funds devoted to research in connection with this important crop. The table cited shows that, whereas forest crops comprise 11.8 percent of the value of all agricultural crops, the State experiment stations have devoted only 0.99 percent of their total expenditures to research in connection with forest crops. The committee believes the obligation of the States to devote their experiment-station funds to research in

forestry is as great as their obligation with respect to research on other farm crops. The existing trend to throw almost the entire burden of research on forest crops upon the Federal Government should, in the opinion of the committee, be halted or at least slowed down and the States should be required to assume a more proportionate share of this responsibility. The committee intends to follow this matter up from year to year and if the State experiment stations show no inclination to meet their responsibilities in this field, the committee will consider what means may exist to require it.

*Forest products.*—The budget estimate of $1,555,000 for forest products research has been reduced to $1,000,000. The work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has never enjoyed the high esteem of the committee or of the Congress. Much of the work pursued at this laboratory is academic or visionary in character and has not, in the opinion of the committee, given practical results consonant with the vast sums which have been applied over the years. The committee believes that the $1,000,000 allowed will be ample for the carrying on of all research which may be worth while.

*Forest resources investigations.*—The budget estimate, of $1,072,000 for forest resources investigations has been reduced by $500,000. Here again, in the opinion of the committee, the work is largely academic and lacks in real practical value. The amount allowed is more than twice that appropriated for the fiscal year 1946 and many years previous thereto. It should be ample to permit the carrying on of all the work which has practical value.

*Forest fire cooperation.*—The committee has approved the full amount of the budget estimate of $9,000,000 for forest fire cooperation. This is in full amount of the authorization. The work done under this appropriation and its value to the forests is, in the opinion of the committee, not excelled by any other activity in the Forest Service.

*Farm and other private forestry cooperation.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $809,500. This is another item which stands high in the esteem of the committee. It is carrying the work direct to the farm and is resulting in additional dollars in the farmers' pocket as well as improvement in the conservation of the soils of the farms.

*Acquisition of lands in national forest.*—The budget of $1,000,000 for acquisition of forest lands has been reduced to $500,000. The bill provides that the money shall be available only for payment for lands purchased. The committee believes that the general administrative funds of the Forest Service are available, and will be ample, to cover the salaries and expenses incidental to the relatively small purchase program provided by the bill.

## FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The appropriation for Forest Roads and Trails is divided into two parts, namely (1) forest highways, or public highways through the national forests and (2) forest-development roads, which are for access roads leading into the forests. The budget estimate for forest highways is in the sum of $11,300,000, which the committee has reduced to $5,300,000, which is a reduction under the budget of $6,000,000. The Federal Highways Act of 1944 authorizes $25,000,000 for forest

highways for each of the three postwar fiscal years. There has already been appropriated $4,500,000 of the authorization for the first postwar fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1946. The budget estimate of $11,300,000 will still be substantially below the total amount authorized for the fiscal year which ended 2 years previous to the end of the fiscal year for which appropriations are being made in this bill. Apparently the needs and the availability of material and labor precluded the possibility of living up to the statutory authorization. The committee believes that in this period of high cost of construction a very limited program should be undertaken and it has therefore made the cut above indicated. A similar philosphy would, of course, apply to forest-development roads. However, in view of the need for these roads to open up additional timber supplies which will be in great demand if and when the building revival gets under way, the committee has reduced the budget estimate of $12,500,000 to $10,000,000. The committee feels assured that the sums provided under the general head of forest roads and trails will be all that can be prudently expended in the next fiscal year.

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

*Research.*—The budget estimate for soil-conservation research is in the sum of $1,423,000, bring in the same amount as for 1947. This research has been going on for a period of almost 20 years under which contour planting and cultivation, terracing, and various other soil-conserving and erosion-preventing devices have been worked out. The committee believes that a great many of the problems attacked by this service in the beginning have been solved; the farmers have been instructed in putting them into practice, and a substantial reduction in the amount of the appropriation can be effected without harm to the cause of soil conservation. It has therefore imposed a cut of $750,000 under the budget estimate leaving for this purpose a total of $673,000.

*Soil conservation operations.*—The budget estimate of $43,437,000, for soil conservation operations is double the amount appropriated for the same purpose 10 years ago. Here again the committee believes that some reduction can be effected without damage to the cause of conservation of the soil and has imposed a cut of $5,437,000, with the restriction that no part of the cut shall be applied to the project for the operation of conservation nurseries. This appropriation is expended primarily in the form of technical advice and assistance rendered to the various State soil conservation districts. As the number of such districts have increased year by year with the accompanying request for technical advice, this appropriation has experienced a parallel growth. The committee believes that many of the soil conservation districts which have been in existence a number of years will be able to get along with materially reduced technical assistance and advice. The advice and assistance given in the initial years of these districts ought not to require repetition year after year, certainly not to the degree such advice was needed in the beginning. The committee believes that the cut imposed can be so distributed by the Department that no harm will come to the work in any of the districts.

The report already points out in connection with the item for Extension Service that the large field forces for extension service, the

Soil Conservation Service and the Farmers Home Administration, all of whom are engaged in related activities, might well be consolidated in the interest of economy. This is a matter which should have immediate attention by the legislative committee on agriculture because the suggested consolidation would be fruitful of greater efficiency and economy.

### CONSERVATION AND USE PAYMENTS

For the fiscal year 1948 there was before the committee a request for $301,720,000 with which to carry on the so-called agricultural adjustment program, better-styled conservation and use payments under the administration of the Production and Marketing Administration. For the fiscal year 1947 there was available for this purpose $314,246,000. For 1948 the request calls for a direct appropriation of $201,720,000 and the transfer of $100,000,000 from section 32 funds, making a total of $301,720,000.

Of this amount roughly $267,000,000 is disbursed to farmers in the form of cash payments and advances for soil-conservation materials and the balance, aggregating about $34,000,000, is devoted to administrative expenses at national, State, and local levels.

The field expense at the county level for administering this program totals about $24,500,000 and embraces the per diem services of 9,087 county committeemen and 97,663 community committeemen.

For National and State administrative purposes the cost is estimated at $9,095,868 and involves the services of 481 persons at the departmental level, and 2,630 at the State level.

After full consideration of the matter the committee determined that funds for payment to farmers for soil conservation practices should be reduced by $117,620,754, leaving a balance for this purpose of $150,000,000 as distinguished from the $267,620,754 requested. In addition the committee provided that administrative expenses at the National and State level should be reduced from $9,095,868 to $6,000,000 and that expenditures at the county and community level should be reduced by the sum of $4,000,000. In addition, a proviso is recommended so that where unexpended funds are available from one area or region, these may within the discretion of the Production and Marketing Administration, be made generally applicable to other areas and regions.

In addition, the committee has stricken from the bill the language which would authorize a $200,000,000 program for the crop year 1948 for this general purpose.

A number of considerations entered into the determination of the committee that the amounts requested for this purpose be substantially reduced. In the first place, it should be pointed out as indicated in the Secretary's statement that farm assets of all kinds exceed by far all such assets for any time in the history of American agriculture.

In the second place, the committee points out that the President has recognized this fact and has suggested in his budget message that for the crop year 1948 these payments could be reduced on the ground that many farmers are in a position to carry on soil-conservation work without a bonus from the Federal Treasury. As a matter of fact, the crop year 1947 would be even better comparatively speaking than the crop year 1948 and there is, therefore, no good reason why the reduction should not be undertaken for the present crop year.

It has been repeatedly affirmed that the Federal Government has made commitments to agricultural producers for the crop year 1947 and is, therefore, obligated to appropriate the requested $301,720,000, but with this view the committee does not agree. In prior years the committee made it plain to departmental officials that the program was contingent upon appropriations made by the Congress and repeatedly insisted that this fact be made clear to agricultural producers. The Department testified that millions of circulars relating to the farm program for 1947 were printed and distributed to all cooperating farmers so that it is abundantly clear to all participants that the program is based upon whatever funds are made available for this purpose.

Well-considered expressions of opinion were placed before the committee to the effect that soil-conservation payments should be deleted entirely from the bill, but the committee believe that it should be tapered off beginning in the present crop year and completely eliminated for the crop year 1948 because the question of a long-range agricultural program is a matter which must be reexamined and redetermined by the Legislative Committee on Agriculture and by the Congress.

Perhaps, one other thing should be mentioned and that is that about 60 percent of all payments distributed under this program are paid to 20 percent of the Nation's farmers. For the crop years 1945 and 1946 more than 63 percent of all participating farmers received less than $60 each, which amounts to but 22 percent of the total payments, whereas 20 percent of all farmers received in excess of $100, amounting to 60 percent of the total payments. This would seem sufficiently persuasive of the need for a complete reevaluation of this program in the light of future needs.

In its deliberations the committee considered the advisability of incorporating in the language of the bill a formula for the distribution of payments under which such payments would be graduated on the basis of ability to conserve. This would provide a larger percentage of the payments in the case of those who would normally receive the smallest payment or advance and then be progressively reduced in the case of those who by virtue of their financial ability and the stability of their farming operations could better afford to undertake this work. This approach, however, was discarded, and the matter of distribution of payments was left in the hands of those who administer the program.

## SECTION 32 FUNDS

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, makes a permanent appropriation of a sum of money equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts of the calendar year last previous to the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. Thirty percent of the customs receipts for the calendar year 1946 amounts to approximately $148,000,000. The purpose of the appropriation is (1) to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and their products, (2) to encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce, and (3) to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. This act was passed during the period of farm surpluses and low prices for farm commodities, with the view to

steadying the market for such commodities through the disposition of the surpluses. But now, in a period of short production rather than over production and of unusually high prices for farm products, there is no need for this appropriation in the fiscal year 1948. The Budget Bureau proposes the use of $100,000,000 of the section 32 funds for 1948 for the payment of benefits to farmers under the agricultural conservation program. The committee has not followed the Budget recommendation respecting the use of this fund in connection with the farm program. It has made a direct appropriation from the Treasury of the full amount recommended in the bill for the farm program and has rescinded the entire amount of the permanent appropriation under section 32 for 1948. The committee wishes to emphasize that its action in rescinding all section 32 funds for the fiscal year 1948 should not be taken to mean that similar action should be taken in future years. This fund is intended to provide relief in emergent periods when a surplus problem exists. It is always possible that such a condition may develop in other years and that the fund may be genuinely necessary to meet this problem. That problem, however, does not exist at the present time and the committee entertains the conviction that for the fiscal year 1948 these funds can be safely rescinded.

### SUGAR ACT

The budget has estimated $55,000,000 for the administration of the provisions of the Sugar Act. This sum is an increase of $1,500,000 above the amount for 1947. The amount allotted for payments to sugar producers under the budget is $53,623,885, the balance being allotted for administrative expenses with the exception of $4,000 which is transferred to the International Production Control Committee and $21,750 transferred to the General Accounting Office. The amount required for payments to sugar producers is somewhat in excess of $55,000,000, but since the latter amount is the maximum authorized to be appropriated, the committee has approved that amount for inclusion in the bill. However, the committee has decided to reduce the administrative expense item by $50,000, which will make that amount additional for payments to sugar producers. It might be of interest to note that the sugar program is not only self-sustaining but in fact returns a profit of $15,000,000 or more per year to the Federal Treasury.

### THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

For the fiscal year 1948 the budget requested a direct annual appropriation of $75,000,000 for the school-lunch program under authority of Public Law 396 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was approved June 4, 1946. Under the provisions of this act appropriations by the Federal Government for the school-lunch program shall be matched by the States on a 1-to-1 basis until 1950, a 1½-to-1 basis from 1950 to 1955 and a 3-to-1 basis after 1955. The act also provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may determine what funds derived from sources within the State may be included for matching purposes.

For fiscal year 1947 the sum of $75,000,000 was made available for the program, but these funds were secured by transfer from what are commonly known as section 32 funds under the act of 1935, which

provides that 30 percent of customs receipts may be set aside for various purposes, such as diversion to new uses, exports, etc., to meet the surplus problems of agriculture.

The committee desires to make plain certain considerations in connection with this program and as a justification for its reduction of the estimates from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000.

Contrary to the generally expressed belief that this is a program of free lunches for school children, the testimony is plain and explicit that only one child out of every nine receives a free meal. Eight out of every nine school children who participate in the program pay the full amount of the school lunch, which would be the cost of lunch minus the Federal subsidy.

Secondly, it should be pointed out that this is no longer a surplus program for here again the testimony is abundantly clear that schools can purchase whatever foods they desire without regard to whether such foods are in surplus supply or not. It has become a nutrition program.

At an early date, it should be pointed out that this is a direct cash subsidy from the Federal Government. An examination of the testimony will disclose that schools operate their own programs, make their own purchases, and render accounts to the State educational authority at the end of each month and are then reimbursed in cash from the funds allotted to the State by the Federal Government and from funds derived within the State.

It appears that in the year 1946 about $234,000,000 was expended on this program in 55,000 schools. This amount was derived from the following sources: the Federal Government provided $75,000,000, States and local subdivisions by direct appropriation provided only $11,500,000, gifts and donations of money, commodities, and services accounted for another $25,000,000, sales of school lunches provided $123,000,000. An interpretation by the Secretary of Agriculture of the provisions of Public Law 396 enables the States to include not only direct appropriations but donations and gifts of all kinds and also the money derived from the sale of lunches to the children for the purposes of this program. The committee believes that while the Secretary of Agriculture does possess such authority under the permissive provisions of the School Lunch Act, it was never the purpose of Congress that funds derived from the children should be included for matching purposes notwithstanding the fact that there was an allusion to this matter in the report which accompanied the School Lunch Act when it was considered by the Congress. The committee believes that the States should by direct appropriations match the money provided by the Federal Government and if such were the case the appropriation herein would be reduced to $11,500,000. The committee believes that it has been more than generous in including for matching purposes funds derived from gifts, donations, and services which total about $25,000,000 and has added thereto an item of $10,000,000 under the provisions of the act relating to nonfood assistance for the acquisition of equipment and facilities. This would total about $45,000,000. In addition thereto, the committee has included a proviso which definitely excludes funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes and also points out herein that it might be advisable to require school authorities to certify their need for Federal funds before they become eligible for Federal assistance.

There is a considerable body of opinion to the effect that the Federal Government should step out of the school lunch program entirely on the ground that this is essentially and primarily a State function and that the States can well afford to carry on this program from their own resources. It is all important that the responsibility for the financing of this program should be shifted back to the States as rapidly as possible, else many of the measures now being undertaken to bring the Federal Government more firmly within the realm of solvency will be aborted. It should be borne in mind that the cost of feeding destitute children in foreign countries falls very largely upon the United States, an obligation which rests 100 percent upon the Federal Treasury. It does not seem too much to suggest that the cost of school lunches for the children of America, most of whom are able to pay for them, might well be borne by the States.

A recent compilation of surpluses accumulated by the various States indicates that the State of California is presently carrying a comfortable State balance of $430,000,000, Iowa, $29,000,000, Illinois, $158,000,000; Mississippi, $40,000,000; Pennsylvania, $234,000,000; North Carolina, $153,000,000. Compare these comfortable balances with the condition of the Federal Government which is wrestling with a staggering load of debt presently estmated to be $258,000,000,000. It should also be pointed out that this program presently reaches about one-fourth of the eligible schools throughout the Nation and that an extension of the program to all such schools will in time cost the Federal Government an estimated $600,000,000 or more annually. The committee is not unmindful of the widespread interest in the school-lunch program but the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government demands that it be kept within due bounds and that the States be required to provide their just share of the program.

## MARKETING SERVICES

The appropriations for marketing services fall under a number of heads. These items cover such activities as the market news service, market inspection of farm products, marketing farm products, tobacco acts, freight rates for farm products, and the enforcement of a number of regulatory acts. The total of the budget estimate for these several services is in the sum of $9,843,000, which is a reduction of $535,072. This reduction is the net effect of relatively small increases in most of the items and a decrease of $1,111,500 under marketing farm products due to the elimination of various regulations and controls, wage stabilization, food, industry and labor programs and other activities necessary for the period immediately following the war. The committee has approved all budget estimates under this head, except as noted below. Under marketing farm products, the committee has imposed a fund cut of $400,000, leaving an appropriation of $1,000,000. The committee believes that the work under this appropriation very closely parallels, if it does not duplicate, the studies provided for in the appropriation for the research and marketing act field. In view of the amount provided under that head, the committee believes the cut of $400,000 can be effected without injury. Under the United States Warehouse Act where the budget is for $685,000, the committee has imposed a cut of $100,000.

## COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The budget estimate for administration of the Commodity Exchange Authority is in the sum of $650,000, which represents an increase of $129,000, above the 1947 appropriation. The committee has allowed $9,000 of the increase to cover the cost of within-grade salary advancements and has disallowed the remainder. This will give the agency the full amount of their 1947 appropriation together with all Pay Act increases and within-grade promotions, which the committee believes will provide as good enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act for the next year as has been had during the current year.

## THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Public Law No. 731 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, known as the Farmers Home Administration Act abolished the rehabilitation programs of the old Farm Security Administration and the emergency crop and feed loan program administered by the FCA and placed these activities together with other functions under the Farmers Home Administration. It is therefore in a sense the descendant of the Farm Security Administration.

Its over-all program now includes: (1) Making and serving farm tenant purchase loans; (2) making, serving, and collecting production and subsistence loans; (3) rural rehabilitation aid; (4) developing with loans and technical guidance the expension of water facilities in arid and semiarid areas; and (5) the establishment and development of a system of farm tenant mortgage insurance.

The committee has made substantial reductions in virtually every item of the FHA, but it should be noted that these reductions are not intended to convey the impression that the committee is dissatisfied with the administrative direction of Mr. Lassiter. In fact, the committee feels that Mr. Lassiter has been a forthright and capable administrator and predicates its reductions on other grounds.

*Farm-tenant loans.*—For fiscal 1947, $50,000,000 was available for this purpose but was reduced to $35,000,000 by the Budget Bureau. The committee recommend a further reduction of $10,000,000. Land values are high. There is reason to believe that before these loans are paid off prices of commodities will recede. It appears inadvisable that undue encouragement should be given to the purchase of farms at inflated values because of the hazards involved to purchasers.

*Production and subsistence loans.*—The estimate of $90,000,000 for this purpose was reduced by $30,000,000. Bank credit is available in abundance, funds are plentiful where justified and $60,000,000 should be sufficient for this program.

*Farm tenant mortgage insurance fund.*—This program is designed to do for farm tenant mortgage loans what the Federal Housing Administration does for urban mortgage loans. It is hoped by the authors of the program that in due time, this system will completely replace the making of Federal loans to tenants for the purchase of farms.

The program however presents a difficulty. The limit of interest on a mortgage that can be insured is 2½ percent and the Administrator candidly stated that as yet, he has no applications for insurance of a farm mortgage loan. It is doubtful whether this program can have any effect until the basic law is modified.

However, the committee is not averse to the creation of the fund, one-half of 1 percent of which can be devoted to expenses and one-half of 1 percent for the building of a reserve fund. An estimated $15,000,000 for this purpose for 1948 is wholly unnecessary, and it has accordingly been reduced to $5,000,000.

*Water facilities.*—The committee approved the budget estimate of $1,750,000 for this purpose. The program has been well administered; it has been kept within reasonable limits, repayments from individuals and associations have been good, and the benefits have been substantial.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The estimate of $30,000,000 for this purpose has been reduced to $25,000,000 for 1948. This is the fund from which salaries and expenses are paid for the rehabilitation and assistance program to farm tenants and here again, the committee wishes to emphasize its conviction that much of this work at the county and farm level is a duplication of work carried on by the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service.

Under this activity, the Farmers Home Administration maintains 439 persons in Washington, 950 persons in 40 State offices, 236 in 150 district offices, 871 in 4 area finance offices, and 5,624 in the county offices. Compare this with Extension Service which has more than 10,000 persons, most of whom are at the county level, and with Soil Conservation Service which maintains offices at the departmental, regional, State, district, and work-unit levels, totaling about 12,000 persons.

Here again, the committee wishes to point out the limitations within the appropriation procedure and suggests immediate action by the legislative committee to consolidate these functions in the interest of efficiency and economy.

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The budget estimate of $5,600,000 for salaries and expenses has been reduced to $4,000,000. This amount exceeds any amount that has been appropriated for this purpose for previous years up to and including 1945. As late as the fiscal year 1938, the appropriation was only $1,450,000. The growth of this appropriation is due very largely to the fact that it is apparently the policy and the purpose of the Rural Electrification Administration to continue its paternal oversight and supervision of each cooperative until the last penny of the cooperative debt has been liquidated. From the inception of the program, those in charge have every year boasted of the financial soundness of the cooperatives. They have reported the large number which have made payments on their loans much in advance of the amounts due at the time.

"Spoon feeding" ad infinitum: In spite of the fact that these cooperatives have had the benefit of the initial advice and supervision on the part of the administration, insistence is made that this same supervision be indefinitely continued. The committee believes that when a cooperative has been "taught to walk," so to speak, and has acquired a substantial equity in the capital investment of the cooperative, that it is in line with sound policy and with the philosophy of individual responsibility upon which this Republic has been erected that they should be permitted thenceforth to "walk alone." Perhaps here and there they may make mistakes but they will be able to absorb the cost of those mistakes out of their equities; and they will have learned their lesson. The committee believes the probability of mistakes on the part of farmer managements of the various cooperatives are no greater than those of the Administrator and his assistants in the office here in Washington operating from long range. This opinion is predicated upon the observations the committee has been able to make of the abilities and qualifications of the managers and members of the boards of the electric cooperatives who have appeared before the committee or whom the members have had the opportunity to observe in the field.

Consequently, the amount of $4,000,000 allowed in the bill, if applied to the supervision of the activities of the more recently organized cooperatives, leaving those organized earlier which have acquired experience and have made substantial payments on their loans to "paddle their own canoe," will, in the opinion of the committee be sufficient to give adequate protection to the investments of the Government and to the newer and less experienced cooperative enterprises.

*Loans.*—The budget estimate of $225,000,000 for Rural Electrification Administration loans to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been allowed, but a provision is inserted authorizing and directing that henceforth such sums shall be borrowed directly from the Secretary of the Treasury, rather than from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and eliminating the existing provision of law that such loans may be made only in the amount of 85 percent of the appraised value of the projects to be constructed from such loans. The budget estimate requested a direct appropriation of $25,000,000 from the Treasury to cover the 15 percent margin resulting from the existing provisions of the law, but, that requirement having been eliminated by the provision carried in the bill, the committee recommends no direct appropriation.

Under the present law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation borrows money from the Secretary of the Treasury at 1 percent interest. It then lends the money to the Rural Electrification Administrator at 1¾ percent interest who, in turn, lends it to the coops at 2 percent. The evidence indicates that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation incurs no administrative expense for determining the soundness of the loans but merely makes such loans as the performance of a ministerial act. Thus, the differential of three-fourths of 1 percent in the interest rate paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury and that which it collects from the Rural

Electrification Administrator, represents a clean profit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of three-fourths of 1 percent. Under the provision included in the bill, all the interest paid by the co-ops on all previous outstanding loans as well as future loans will go immediately to the Treasury, without the present stop-over on the part of three-fourths of 1 percent in the coffers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there to be commingled with the deficit or the surplus, as the case may be, of the Corporation's over-all capital fund. On the basis of the present total outstanding REA loans, the flow of payments from the co-ops to the Treasury will be increased by approximately $4,280,000 per annum.

The committee was importuned to authorize loan funds far in excess of those submitted by the budget. It believes that the amount carried in the bill will be more than ample to care for all construction that can possibly be made under the existing restrictions resulting from scarcity of materials and equipment of every kind essential to the setting up and placing in full operation of the farmer electric cooperatives.

A condition is arising in the rural electrification field which merits the attention of Congress, and particularly the legislative committee which has jurisdiction over REA matters. It relates to the construction of generating facilities in those areas where an adequate power supply now exists. If REA undertakes to duplicate such facilities, it is likely to develop a condition under which the cooperatives which obligate themselves for such facilities, as well as the private utilities operating in the same field, may experience difficulty in operating on a pay-in basis, and no good purpose could be served by such a condition.

The committee discussed the advisability of a proposal to confer upon the Federal Power Commission or upon the State commissions or authorities having jurisdiction of such matter, the power to veto a loan for the acquisition, construction, operation, enlargement, or extension of a generating plant unless there was a finding that such acquisition, construction, operation, enlargement, or extension would result in lower cost of electrical energy to a rural electrification project or that the supply of power from existing generating facilities was inadequate for all rural electrification needs.

The committee wishes to point out that if a duplication of unnecessary facilities should develop it will affect the real payment capacity of cooperatives as well as the return to existing utilities on capital investment and might ultimately produce the same condition which developed in the transportation industry resulting in tremendous losses to innocent holders of securities.

At the present time there is no existing limitation upon REA in this respect and it is believed that an appropriate agency either in the Federal or State government should have some supervisory authority in this matter.

### CROP INSURANCE

In February 1938 Congress approved the creation of a Crop Insurance Corporation to make available insurance against all natural

hazards on wheat. In 1941 this program was expanded to include cotton. The program operated for a number of years with very substantial losses and its liquidation was provided for by a provision carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944. That provision was subsequently modified and the program was reinstated as of December 23, 1944, and made applicable to wheat, cotton, and flax on a national basis and to certain other commodities on a trial basis.

The Crop Insurance Corporation was originally capitalized at $100,000,000 and received its operating funds by issuing portions of its capital stock from time to time to the Federal Treasury. Provision is carried in this bill for an additional subscription to the capital stock in the sum of $10,000,000 and this will exhaust the Corporation's borrowing power. That is to say, that administrative expenses over the years plus losses has finally exhausted the $100,000,000 which was made available for this experiment in crop insurance. It is the considered opinion of the subcommittee that the program should be placed entirely upon an experimental basis and that the Corporation's request for administrative funds for the fiscal year in the sum of $9,330,000 be reduced to $2,000,000 and that whatever funds are not required for this purpose shall be returned to the Treasury. It is appropriate to note that the Committee on Agriculture has reported a bill (H. R. ——) to place this activity on a completely experimental basis. This action is in line with the views entertained by the committee and provides further justification for the sharp reduction in administrative expenses which has been recommended in this bill.

Included in the hearings is a detailed statement by the Secretary of Agriculture appraising the operations of this program which sets forth some dismal experiences with high administrative costs, small premium totals, and high losses in various States. While the original program has been modified to place it on a sounder actuarial basis, losses are still excessive and if administrative expenditures are included for the purpose of securing a complete picture of the outlay which has been made from Federal funds for the crop-insurance program it becomes impressive of the fact that unless a sound and actuarial approach is developed through experimentation the entire program should be completely liquidated.

Consider wheat as an example. Since the beginning of the program in 1939, the Corporation has been able to achieve the insurance of less than 15 percent of the wheat acreage in the country and the interesting fact about wheat insurance is that it appears to have least appeal to the farmers in the plains areas of the country where it would appear to be most essential.

In respect of cotton the Corporation freely recognized the moral hazard involved and the heavy losses which it sustained on the cotton program during the last crop year. The aggregate of premiums from insurance on cotton was roughly $33,000,000, whereas losses totaled nearly $76,500,000 and in some States the loss ratio between premiums collected and losses paid ran as high as 8 to 1.

In five States it would appear that administrative expenses actually exceeded by far the premiums which were collected.

The committee was not unmindful of the fact that a small profit was returned on the insurance program with respect to flax and tobacco, but it must point out that for a crop-insurance program, administered by the Federal Government at high administrative costs, to succeed the program must be placed on a national basis and must be actuarially sound. It is recognized, of course, that this was the goal to be sought when Federal crop insurance was first authorized but the sad fact remains that this experiment has cost the Federal Government $100,000,000 or more to date and it contains no assurance that sounder and better methods have been perfected which will avert extraordinary losses in the future.

In the judgment of many the program should be liquidated entirely. The committee, however, by reducing administrative expenditures from 9⅓ million dollars to 2 million dollars wishes to indicate its conviction that at the very best the program should not go beyond the experimental stage and should be completely skeletonized.

## COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A word about the functions and operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation might be of value as general information to the Congress.

The Corporation operates through a board of directors of which the Secretary of Agriculture is the chairman and operates through the facilities of the Production and Marketing Administration. Its primary purpose is to support agricultural prices in order to preserve farm purchasing power and incentives for production.

Farm prices are supported in a number of ways:

1. By making loans to farmers on their commodities.
2. By purchasing commodities which are in surplus and diverting them into channels where the pressure on the normal commercial market will not be so great.
3. By purchasing commodities for foreign distribution.

Funds for this operation are obtained from the Treasury Department under the borrowing power of the Corporation. The mechanics of this process are simple.

The Corporation issues its note to the Treasury and funds are then advanced. There is a requirement in the act of 1938 under which the Corporation's assets must at no time be less than its liabilities. This relationship is normally maintained by the fact that the Corporation has a capital stock of $100,000,000 so that as it makes loans or purchases and thereby secures assets in the form of commodities or bankable notes, it can comply with the 1938 act.

This fact is of more than academic importance because the committee examined into an item of $500,000,000 in cash which is available to the Corporation by act of Congress for virtually the same purposes as the general credit which the CCC enjoys.

61462—47——5

The committee explored the necessity for maintaining this cash balance and was advised that while it has not been touched since 1941, an impairment of the balance between assets and liabilities of the CCC through loans and purchases might make it necessary to use a portion of this fund to maintain that balance as required by law. There is real doubt that the legal requirement for this balance is necessary and if the law were amended, it would be possible to rescind these funds and restore them to the Treasury. The Corporation actually enjoys a credit account of 4½ billion dollars which should be more than adequate for every foreseeable purpose.

The Corporation's activities might be listed under three general classifications.

1. Price supports for basic commodities. The AAA Act of 1935 as amended requires that prices on the six basic commodities of corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts be supported at 90 percent of the parity price and this is accomplished by loans to producers since these commodities are storable.

2. Price-support program on Steagall commodities. The so-called Steagall amendment to the act of 1941 requires that prices on certain commodities (about 20 in number) be supported for a period of 2 years after the January following the termination of hostilities as proclaimed by the President. Since that proclamation was issued in December of 1946, existing law requires that prices on these commodities be supported until December 31, 1948. The list of so-called Steagall commodities includes beans, chickens, long-staple cotton, eggs, flaxseed hogs, milk and butterfat, dry peas, sweetpotatoes, white potatoes, soybeans, and turkeys.

The Corporation as of this time can only estimate what market conditions may be like and what action may be necessary by ways of purchases to keep prices at required levels.

3. Price supports on other commodities. The Corporation is also authorized to support prices on a third group of commodities which include barley, flax fiber, hemp fiber, naval stores, oats, rye, hay and pasture seeds, winter cover crop seeds, grain sorghums, and wool.

4. A fourth program is called the general supply purchases program which is devoted mainly to the acquisition of commodities to cover foreign requirements and relief commitments.

5. The only subsidy program which will be operative in the present year and in the next fiscal year relates to sugar and embraces all operations relating to the purchase of sugar supplies from foreign sources.

6. Other programs include a foreign purchase program and a commodity export program.

It is estimated that administrative expenses for this entire program for fiscal 1948 will be $11,516,109 which is a reduction of $3,237,524. Slightly more than $3,000,000 of this amount will be received by transfer from UNRRA, foreign governments and other sources for services rendered so that the administrative expenditure from Corporation funds will be $8,450,000.

The committee has not reduced this estimated amount.

There is a growing belief that farm prices will decline in the months ahead and that the work of the Corporation might be as large a volume as in the prior fiscal year. This, of course, is conjectural but it was the feeling of the committee that since price supports are mandated by existing law, the Corporations must be provided with adequate personnel and funds to carry out this statutory directive.

## LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 23 of the bill, in connection with the item for meat inspection:

*Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal-year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat-inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: Provided further, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: Provided further, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the Budget as submitted to Congress annually: And provided further, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.*

On page 58, under the Farmers Home Administration:

*All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provisions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Recon-*

*struction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or advances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public debt transaction of the United States.*

On page 61, in connection with the Rural Electrification Administration:

*Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947, shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the foregoing provision: Provided, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the*

*Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a), any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public debt transaction of the United States.*

*"Sec. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the payment of such loans all moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."*

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*

[NOTE.—The increases and decreases shown are based on comparison with the 1947 estimated available figures]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| To replace the official automobile of the Secretary (nonrecurring). | +$3,000 | Approved. |
| To establish employee health program pursuant to Public Law 658, 79th Cong. | +45,000 | Do. |
| To strengthen the employee safety program | +10,000 | General reduction of $100,000 imposed against the direct appropriation. |
| To replace worn-out office equipment (nonrecurring) | +7,500 | |
| To maintain adequate central departmental telephone, telegraph, and records services. | +26,000 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +26,850 | Approved. |
| PENALTY MAIL (SEC. 2, PUBLIC LAW 364, 78TH CONG.) | | |
| To cover, in part, increase in mailing rate from $15 to $18.60 per thousand pieces. | +500,000 | Disallowed |
| RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946 | | |
| For payments to States for research at State experiment stations. | +5,000,000 | $3,000,000 allowed. |
| For research on utilization and associated problems in connection with the development and application of present, new, and extended uses of agricultural commodities and products thereof. | +6,000,000 | $1,000,000 allowed. |
| For broadening and strengthening agricultural research, other than utilization research. | +3,000,000 | Do. |
| For research and service work on the marketing of agricultural products. | +5,000,000 | Do. |
| OFFICE OF SOLICITOR | | |
| Salaries and expenses: For within-grade salary advancements. | +46,000 | General reduction of $100,000 imposed against the direct appropriation. |
| OFFICE OF INFORMATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| Decrease in transfers | [−9,735] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+38,950] | General reduction of $125,000. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+29,215] | |
| Increase in direct appropriation: | | |
| To provide a staff adequate to handle the accounting, auditing, and related fiscal responsibilities. | +8,000 | |
| For additional work in answering public and Congressional requests for agricultural information, and for editorial and other work on publications. | +20,000 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,950 | |
| Printing and binding: | | |
| Decrease in transfers | [−15,000] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+296,400] | Do. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+281,400] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation: | | |
| For increased printing costs of program forms, schedules, Farmers' Bulletin lists and periodicals, and Agriculture Yearbook. | +228,200 | Do. |
| For printing technical publications on results of Department research. | +28,200 | Do. |
| For printing new Farmers' Bulletins, reprints and forest map folders. | +40,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| LIBRARY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation." | [−$850] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+42,000] | Do. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+41,150] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation: For exchange of publications with libraries in foreign countries, +$20,000; indexing foreign literature issued during the war years, +$10,000; funds by direct appropriation in lieu of annual transfers from Commodity Credit Corporation administrative funds—an offsetting decrease being shown in the CCC budget, +$850; and for within-grade salary advancements, +$11,150. | +42,000 | Do. |
| BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS | | |
| Economic investigations: | | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation." | [−80,150] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+80,143] | |
| Net decrease in funds available | [−7] | |
| Increase in direct appropriation: | | |
| Increase of $80,150 in direct appropriation in lieu of transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation (shown as offsetting decrease in CCC budget) and a decrease of $7 to round off the appropriation total. | +80,143 | General reduction of $750,000 in direct appropriation. |
| Crop and livestock estimates: | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation to round off appropriation total. | −$50 | Approved. |
| OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS | | |
| Salaries and expenses | | $100,000 reduction imposed. |
| EXTENSION SERVICE | | |
| Payments to States: | | |
| To extend benefits of sec. 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, as authorized by the act of Aug. 28, 1937, in order to help meet urgent health, nutrition, production, and related problems. | +134,000 | Approved. |
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION | | |
| OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For work at the Agricultural Research Center on repair of sewage system, expansion and improvement of coal yard facilities, repair and improvement of roads, installation of a small bituminous materials mixing plant, and maintenance and operation of water treatment plant ($54,200 is nonrecurring). | +75,000 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out farm and other equipment (nonrecurring). | +35,000 | Do. |
| For employment of safety engineer-fire control officer | +4,400 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,400 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring construction items provided in 1947 act. | −141,800 | Do. |
| Elimination of special item in 1947 act for exploratory investigations of agricultural problems in Alaska. | −20,000 | Do. |
| Special research fund | | $100,000 reduction imposed against "Special research projects." |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS | | |
| To develop domestic sources of natural rubber from guayule and other rubber-bearing plants. | +$170,000 | $100,000 reduction imposed against "Special research projects." |
| For investigations of improved methods for extracting and processing rubber from guayule and other rubber-bearing plants. | +179,000 | Do. |
| Research on agricultural problems of Alaska | | A total of $144,940 allowed, $100,000 being an increase by the committee and $44,940 transferred from the budget item for payments to Alaska for an agricultural experiment station. |
| OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS | | |
| Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico | | $2,440 of the Budget estimate for Bankhead-Jones Act payments and $42,500 for special Alaska acts, total $44,940, transferred to direct supervision of Secretary of Agriculture under the preceding item for research on agricultural problems of Alaska. |
| Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: | | |
| To overcome a backlog in important publications work. | +14,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +3,000 | Do. |
| Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico: | | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring construction items provided in the 1947 act. | −62,500 | Do. |
| BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY | | |
| Animal husbandry: | | |
| For additional personnel to properly care for experimental animals. | +25,000 | Do. |
| For increased participation in National Poultry Improvement program. | +50,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring items provided in 1947 act for construction of buildings at Glendale, Ariz., poultry station. | −20,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of funds provided in 1947 act for studies of needs for poultry research programs in the Southern Great Plains and Southeastern States. | −7,500 | Do. |
| To replace trucks at field experiment stations (nonrecurring). | +11,500 | Do. |
| For repair, reconditioning and improvement of facilities at six field stations (nonrecurring). | +100,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,000 | Do. |
| Diseases of animals: | | |
| To strengthen research work on brucellosis of cattle and swine. | +30,000 | Do. |
| For additional personnel to properly care for experimental animals. | +21,500 | Do. |
| For additional work on Newcastle disease of poultry | +50,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring items provided in 1947 act for construction at the Agricultural Research Center. | −105,000 | Do. |
| For improvements to heating plant at the Agricultural Research Center (nonrecurring). | +40,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,500 | Do. |
| Inspection and quarantine: | | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring portion of the $85,000 supplemental appropriation for 1947 to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, in the Carribean. | −75,000 | Approved, and further reductions totaling $114,803 imposed, $81,806 relating to controls over interstate shipments of livestock and $32,997 against the function of supervising the importation of animal byproducts. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +15,000 | |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY—continued | | |
| Meat inspection: | | |
| For additional veterinarians and lay inspectors | +$500,000 | Reduction of $6,140,000 imposed below budget estimate. Committee recommends a $5,000,000 working capital fund with provision placing the service on a self-supporting basis. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +240,000 | |
| Virus-Serum-Toxin Act | | General reduction of $50,000 imposed. |
| Marketing agreements, hog-cholera virus and serum (transfer): | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | [+500] | Approved. |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: | | |
| Decrease in available funds to meet emergencies arising from outbreaks of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals (budget carries $100,000 token appropriation and language making any funds in the Department available for such work pending appropriation of funds for the purpose). | −205,000 | Budget proposal approved. |
| Elimination of special 1947 appropriation | −9,000,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For analyzing experimental breeding data | +10,000 | General reduction of $75,000 imposed against budget project to which these items relate. |
| To meet increased operating costs, particularly dairy feeds. | +25,188 | |
| For adequate enforcement of the Process Butter Act | +7,000 | Approved. |
| | | Further reduction of $50,000 imposed below Budget. $25,000 against the nutritional project and $25,000 against the project relating to investigations on milk and its products. |
| BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING | | |
| Field crops: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +125,000 | Approved. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +36,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −71,400 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +31,100 | Do. |
| Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +125,000 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +33,700 | Do. |
| For repair and installation of utilities at Agricultural Research Center (nonrecurring). | +180,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −165,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +26,000 | Do. |
| Forest diseases: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +20,000 | Allowed, except for $5,050 pertaining to work on diseases of young natural stands and plantations which the committee has eliminated entirely by a total reduction of $80,720 below the Budget. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +6,800 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,600 | |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING—continued | | |
| Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +$50,000 | General reduction of $100,000 below Budget imposed under the general project for soil improvement, management, and irrigation research. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +17,500 | Reduction of $50,000 imposed in estimate for work on fertilizers. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +23,500 | Approved. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −50,000 | Do. |
| Agricultural engineering: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +30,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +7,300 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −37,300 | Do. |
| National Arboretum: | | |
| For preparation of detailed plans and specifications for buildings and other physical facilities (nonrecurring). | +150,000 | Disallowed. |
| For acquisition of land on which options will expire in July 1947 (nonrecurring). | +350,000 | Approved. |
| For construction of roads (nonrecurring) | +117,000 | Disallowed. |
| For utilities which should be installed concurrently with the proposed road construction (nonrecurring). | +57,100 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +1,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE | | |
| Insect investigations: | | |
| To strengthen investigations on forest insects in western States. | +35,000 | Do. |
| To reestablish the parasite receiving station at Hoboken, N. J. | +17,000 | Do. |
| To study effectiveness of new insecticidal materials | +23,000 | General reduction of $47,900 below estimate for "Control investigations" work. |
| To determine methods of deinsecticizing planes and other carriers and their cargoes. | +50,000 | |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +45,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +30,500 | Approved. Reductions below budget imposed: $82,100 against work on insects affecting man and animals, and $58,700 against insect identification and classification. |
| Insect and plant-disease control: | | |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +78,500 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +36,900 | $22,600 allowed. Reductions below budget imposed: Dutch elm disease, $269,900; pink bollworm project, $500,000. |
| Foreign plant quarantines: | | |
| For inspection of plants and plant products moving into the continental United States by air traffic. | +214,000 | Approved. |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +10,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +34,000 | Do. |
| Control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases. | | Reduction of $750,000 below Budget imposed, $500,000 against the reserve fund and $250,000 against pear psylla control. |
| TUSSOCK MOTH CONTROL | | |
| Elimination of special item provided in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. | −395,000 | Do |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY | | |
| Regional research laboratories: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +$80,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| To provide for prompt dissemination and application of results of scientific investigations in human nutrition and home economics. | +25,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,000 | Do. |
| WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL | | |
| Reduction in eradication program, as follows: | | Approved, and a reduction of $250,000 imposed in the project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction. |
| State and privately-owned lands | −1,310,761 | |
| National forests | −624,821 | |
| Interior Department lands | −64,418 | |
| FOREST SERVICE | | |
| General administrative expenses | | General cut of $32,000 imposed. |
| National forest protection and management: | | |
| Strengthen fire control work | +300,000 | Approved. |
| For timber sales work | +600,000 | Disallowed. |
| (Decrease arising from elimination of special transfer to this appropriation in 1947 from the item "Acquisition of lands for national forests" (timber sales), contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947). | −410,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +324,000 | Approved, except as may be affected by the following reductions below the budget. |
| Fighting forest fires: | | |
| Decrease arising from the fact that the usual annual deficiency has been provided for 1947, whereas 1948 budget includes only the customary token appropriation of $100,000. | −3,944,000 | Approved. |
| Forest and range management investigations: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +45,000 | Reduction of $200,000 below budget imposed against the forest-management project. General management, etc. $500,000; Maintenance of improvements 100,000; Protection of wildlife resources (eliminates project) 162,813; Land-use management 182,296; 945,109 |
| Forest products | | Reduction of $555,000 imposed. |
| Forest resources investigations | | Reduction of $500,000 imposed. |
| Forest fire cooperation: | | |
| For cooperative fire protection on State and private lands (provides $9,000,000 as authorized for 1948). | +700,000 | Approved. |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests: | | |
| Reduction in level of program (Weeks Act) | −2,000,000 | Approved, and further reduction of $500,000 imposed. |
| (Increase arising from elimination of special transfer from this appropriation in 1947 to the item "National forest protection and management," contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.) | +410,000 | Approved. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS | | |
| Control of tree insect epidemics, national forests: | | |
| Elimination of special item provided in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. | −$282,500 | Approved. |
| Forest highways | −2,414,222 | Approved, and further reduction of $6,000,000 imposed. |
| Forest road development | | Reduction of $2,500,000 imposed. |
| FLOOD CONTROL | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation—budget estimate and available prior year balances will provide approximately $2,519,000 (a reduction of about $1,000,000 below 1947). | −1,600,000 | Approved. |
| SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE | | |
| Soil conservation research: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,200 | Approved, and general reduction of $750,000 imposed. |
| Reduction in water regulation investigations, Everglades region of Florida. | −13,200 | |
| Soil conservation operations: | | |
| To provide technical and other assistance to additional conservation districts in the planning and application of soil and water conservation farming practices. | +2,205,000 | Approved. |
| Elimination of funds provided in 1947 act to purchase Government surplus equipment. | −2,500,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of funds for cooperation with other agencies in areas to be incorporated within conservation districts. | −188,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +620,000 | Reduction of $5,437,000 below budget, to be applied primarily to national, regional, State, and district offices. |
| LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND | | |
| To complete construction of the Little Grassy Dam in Southern Illinois (nonrecurring). | +237,200 | General cut of $1,660,000 below Budget imposed. |
| To reconstruct and repair spillways and other structures on six dams located on land-utilization projects (nonrecurring). | +1,458,600 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,200 | |
| WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS | | |
| Elimination of direct appropriation (prior year balances which are available until expended will provide about $1,042,000 for this program in 1948). | −700,000 | Approved. |
| PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION | | |
| CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation and reappropriations | [−112,526,000] | Transfer from sec. 32 funds disallowed; $117,520,754 reduction below budget for program expenses, including elimination of aerial photographic laboratory; $10,000,000 reduction in administrative expenses (no cut in tobacco marketing quota program expenses). Planning authorization for a 1948 conservation program eliminated. |
| Proposed transfer from section 32 funds | [+100,000,000] | |
| Net decrease in funds available, as detailed below | [−12,526,000] | |
| Elimination of a special item for legume and grass seed production. | −12,500,000 | Approved. |
| Elimination of non-recurring item provided in 1947 Act to restore funds for advance purchases of conservation materials and services. | −600,000 | Do. |
| For administrative expenses in connection with the tobacco marketing quota program. | +574,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| SUGAR ACT | | |
| For payments to sugar producers | +$1,426,988 | Approved. |
| For increased costs for service performed by personnel of county associations. | +75,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of transfers to the Treasury Department | −6,130 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +4,142 | Reduction of $50,000 below budget estimate for national office expenses. |
| National School Lunch Act | −6,000,000 | Reduction of $30,000,000 below the $75,000,000 budget. |
| Administration of Agricultural Marketing Agreements and Orders. | | New item of $525,300 inserted by committee to continue activities relating to the Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, presently financed with section 32 funds which the committee bill rescinds in full for 1948. |
| MARKETING SERVICES | | |
| Market news service: | | |
| For market news on livestock, meats and wool | +11,000 | Approved. |
| For market news on fruits and vegetables | +23,000 | Do. |
| For market news on dairy and poultry products | +16,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +19,028 | Do. |
| Market inspection of farm products: | | |
| For inspection and certification of fresh and processed fruits and vegetables. | +15,000 | Do. |
| To provide for farmers a soybean and flaxseed testing service. | +15,000 | Do. |
| To provide a wool testing service for grease wools | +70,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +16.000 | Do. |
| Marketing farm products: | | |
| Elimination of regulations, allocations, controls, pricing, the wage stabilization and food industry labor programs, and other activities which were necessary for the period immediately following the war. | −1,121,615 | Approved, and further reduction of $400,000 imposed (general). |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,115 | |
| Tobacco Acts: | | |
| To extend inspection, grading, and other services to additional auction sales. | +200,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,000 | Do. |
| Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency, and Standard Container Acts: | | |
| To process an increased volume of complaints and applications for licenses under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. | +50,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +4,200 | Do. |
| United States Grain Standards Act: | | |
| To provide Federal supervisory inspection facilities for grain in Grand Forks, N. Dak. | +18,400 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out laboratory, grading, and automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +41,600 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,000 | Do. |
| United States Warehouse Act: | | |
| For initiating work necessary to a determination of rates to be charged by licensed warehousemen. | +35,000 | General reduction of $100,000 below budget. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,000 | |
| Packers and Stockyards Act: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,300 | Approved. |
| Naval Stores Act: | | |
| To replace automotive equipment (nonrecurring) | +1,800 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +1,100 | Do. |
| COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY | | |
| Commodity Exchange Act: | | |
| For supervision of an anticipated increased volume of futures trading. | +38,052 | Disallowed. |
| For more adequate and frequent audits of records of all registered brokerage firms. | +35,720 | Do. |
| For more frequent examination of trading techniques and records and for assembling evidence for hearing or court proceedings. | +46,228 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +9,000 | Approved. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY—Con. | | |
| SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR | | |
| No estimate is included in the 1948 Budget for this program (present funds available until Dec. 31, 1947). | −$12,000,000 | Approved. |
| FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Reduction in amount estimated for farm tenancy loans | −15,000,000 | Approved, and further reduction of $10,000,000 imposed. |
| Reduction in amount estimated for production and subsistence loans | −4,000,000 | Approved, and further reduction of $30,000,000 imposed. |
| Elimination of an unobligated balance available for production and subsistence loans in 1947. | −1,611,282 | |
| To establish the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund authorized by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946. | +15,000,000 | $5,000,000 approved for this fund. |
| Net savings in operating costs due to consolidation of Farm Security Administration and Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division of Farm Credit Administration, reduction in the number of borrowers, consolidation of approximately 95 county offices with adjoining offices, and other economies. | −4,973,522 | Further reduction of $5,000,000 below budget, allowing a total of $25,000,000. |
| Elimination of rural rehabilitation grant program | −42,324 | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans" to Farm Credit Administration for cost of over-all administration of crop-loan program which was under supervision of FCA until Oct. 31, 1946. | −102,015 | |
| For expenses incident to examining, approving, and servicing approximately 2,250 insured mortgages. | +766,995 | |
| Elimination of transfer to the Treasury Department | −77,434 | |
| RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +50,000 | General reduction of $1,600,000 below budget. |
| Loans: | | |
| Direct appropriation for loans | [+25,000,000] | Disallowed. |
| Decrease in authorization to borrow loan funds from RFC. | [−25,000,000] | RFC borrowing authorization deleted, with provision for borrowings by REA from the Treasury. |
| No change in funds available for loans | [0] | $25,000,000 reduction. |
| The budget proposes a direct appropriation of $25,000,000 for loans, the security for which will provide the necessary collateral margin for borrowings from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with an offsetting decrease in the authorization to borrow from RFC. | | |
| FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| A net decrease of $59,000 in available funds resulting from economies in operations, distributed by sources of funds as follows: | | |
| Direct appropriation | −23,000 | Approved. |
| Assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system. | +100,910 | Do. |
| Elimination of transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans." | −102,015 | Do. |
| Reimbursements from Reconstruction Finance Corporation. | −34,895 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For expenses in handling an increased work load in State offices due to greater participation in the program, including processing of insurance contracts and indemnity claims; and to strengthen the adjustment organization to hold losses to a minimum. | +$701,154 | Total amount recommended in bill for 1948 is $2,000,000, accompanied by language limiting its use to continuation of experimental crop insurance, as authorized, and liquidation of 1947 and prior crop year insurance contracts (except experimental insurance contracts). |
| For processing in the branch offices approximately 237,000 additional insurance contracts and 106,000 additional indemnity claims during 1948. | +191,259 | |
| For expenses in headquarters office to improve actuarial data. | +13,713 | |
| For cost of writing approximately 40,000 contracts covering three new trial insurance commodities. | +120,000 | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring expenses on three-year cotton and wheat contracts, and reduction due to discontinuance of trial insurance on corn and tobacco. | −236,270 | |
| For storage costs on commodity stocks to be purchased when premium notes mature on the 1947 crop, and for increased storage costs on commodity inventory carried over from the 1945 and 1946 crops. | +714,000 | |
| Elimination of transfers to the Treasury Department. | −22,821 | |
| Nominal reduction in transfer to "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938." | −368 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +59,333 | |
| Appropriation for use by Secretary of Treasury in subscribing to capital stock (net reduction; $20,000,000 appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, against $10,000,000 recommended for 1948). | −10,000,000 | Approved. |
| COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION | | |
| Administrative expenses from Corporation funds: | | |
| Discontinuance and liquidation of beef and dairy production and sheep and lamb subsidy programs. | [−2,579,000] | Do. |
| Liquidation of certain foreign contract settlement activities. | [−300,000] | Do. |
| Elimination of transfers to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Library. | [−81,000] | Do. |
| For administration of price support programs | [+2,540,650] | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | [+109,350] | Do. |

**TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION**

NOTE.—In addition, the committee bill recommends, under title III, that the permanent appropriation for 1948 under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, be rescinded. It is estimated in the 1948 budget at $148,000,000; a more current estimate is $000,000,000.

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED FOR 1947, THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1948, AND THE AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE ACCOMPANYING BILL FOR 1948

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

### TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 [1] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Office of the Secretary (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *$87, 560* | *$87, 560* | *$87, 560* | | |
| Direct appropriation | [2] 2, 031, 650 | 2, 150, 000 | 2, 050, 000 | +$18, 350 | −$100, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 119, 210* | *2, 237, 560* | *2, 137, 560* | *+18, 350* | *−100, 000* |
| Penalty mail (sec. 2, Public Law 364, 78th Cong.) | 3, 186, 000 | 3, 686, 000 | 3, 186, 000 | | −500, 000 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | | 19, 000, 000 | 6, 000, 000 | +6, 000, 000 | −13, 000, 000 |
| Office of Solicitor (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *136, 000* | *136, 000* | *136, 000* | | |
| Direct appropriation | 2, 479, 000 | 2, 525, 000 | 2, 425, 000 | −54, 000 | −100, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 615, 000* | *2, 661, 000* | *2, 561, 000* | *−54, 000* | *−100, 000* |
| Office of Information: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *13, 710* | *13, 975* | *13, 975* | *+265* | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct appropriation | [3] 661, 050 | 700, 000 | 575, 000 | −86, 050 | −125, 000 |
| *Total* | *674, 760* | *713, 975* | *588, 975* | *−85, 785* | *−125, 000* |
| Printing and binding: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *185, 000* | *170, 000* | *95, 300* | *−89, 700* | *−74, 700* |
| Direct appropriation | 1, 310, 600 | 1, 607, 000 | 1, 607, 000 | +296, 400 | |
| *Total* | *1, 495, 600* | *1, 777, 000* | *1, 702, 300* | *+206, 700* | *−74, 700* |
| *Total, Office of Information* | *2, 170, 360* | *2, 490, 975* | *2, 291, 275* | *+120, 915* | *−199, 700* |
| Library (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *850* | | | *−850* | |
| Direct appropriation | 618, 000 | 660, 000 | 660, 000 | +42, 000 | |
| *Total* | *618, 850* | *660, 000* | *660, 000* | *+41, 150* | |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics: | | | | | |
| Economic investigations: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *80, 150* | | | *−80, 150* | |
| Direct appropriation | 2, 413, 457 | 2, 493, 600 | 1, 743, 600 | −669, 857 | −750, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 493, 607* | *2, 493, 600* | *1, 743, 600* | *−750, 007* | *−750, 000* |

[1] Individual amounts in this column include provision for additional funds to meet costs arising from the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390), by transfer from other appropriations currently available pursuant to authorization in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[2] For comparability with the budget estimate, excludes a total of $16,850 proposed for transfer in 1948, as follows: $12,550 to "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information" (for accounting and fiscal functions), and $4,300 to "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service" (for accounting and fiscal functions). Committee approves.

[3] For comparability with the budget estimate, includes $12,550 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Continued | | | | | |
| Crop and livestock estimates (direct appropriation) | [4] $2,375,450 | $2,375,400 | $2,375,400 | −$50 | |
| *Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics* | *4,869,057* | *4,869,000* | *4,119,000* | *−750,057* | *−$750,000* |
| Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (salaries and expenses) | 728,000 | 728,000 | 628,000 | −100,000 | −100,000 |
| International Production Control Committees [5] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [ ] | [ ] |
| Extension Service: | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | |
| Capper-Ketcham Act | 1,480,000 | 1,480,000 | 1,480,000 | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act, title II: | | | | | |
| Sec. 21 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | | |
| Sec. 23 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional extension work | 555,000 | 555,000 | 555,000 | | |
| Alaska | 23,950 | 23,950 | 23,950 | | |
| Puerto Rico | 140,000 | 274,000 | 274,000 | +134,000 | |
| Total, payments to States | 22,698,950 | 22,832,950 | 22,832,950 | +134,000 | |
| Salaries and expenses: Administration and coordination of extension work | [6] 827,200 | 827,200 | 827,200 | | |
| Total, Extension Service | [7] 23,526,150 | [7] 23,660,150 | [7] 23,660,150 | +134,000 | |
| Agricultural Research Administration: | | | | | |
| Office of Administrator (salaries and expenses) | 523,500 | 481,500 | 481,500 | −42,000 | |
| Special Research Fund | 1,303,000 | 1,303,000 | 1,203,000 | −100,000 | −100,000 |
| Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials (Rubber investigations) | | 349,000 | 349,000 | +349,000 | |
| Research on agricultural problems of Alaska | | | [8] 144,940 | +144,940 | +144,940 |

[4] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $3,450 proposed transfer in 1948 from the appropriation "Naval stores investigations," Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry (for naval stores statistics work). Committee approves.

[5] Authorization to transfer funds for this purpose from the appropriation made by sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 ($8,500) and from the appropriation for the Sugar Act ($4,000).

[6] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $4,300 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.

[7] In addition, $4,704,710 is available for payments to States by permanent appropriation without annual action of Congress.

[8] Includes $44,940 transferred by the committee from the appropriations for payments to States and Territories for agricultural experiment stations.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Office of Experiment Stations: | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | |
| Hatch Act | $720, 000 | $720, 000 | $720, 000 | | |
| Adams Act | 720, 000 | 720, 000 | 720, 000 | | |
| Purnell Act | 2, 880, 000 | 2, 880 000 | 2, 880, 000 | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act | 2, 663, 708 | 2, 663, 708 | 2, 661, 268 | [8a] −$2, 440 | [8a] −$2, 440 |
| Hawaii | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | | |
| Alaska | 42, 500 | 42, 500 | | [8a] −42, 500 | [8a] −42, 500 |
| Puerto Rico | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | | |
| Total, payments to States | 7, 206, 208 | 7, 206, 208 | 7, 161, 268 | −44, 940 | −44, 940 |

[8a] Transferred to appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska."

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Administration of grants and coordination of research with States | 194, 000 | 211, 000 | 211, 000 | +17, 000 | |
| Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico | 177, 200 | 114, 700 | 114, 700 | −62, 500 | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 371, 200 | 325, 700 | 325, 700 | −45, 500 | |
| Total, Office of Experiment Stations | 7, 577, 408 | 7, 531, 908 | 7, 486, 968 | −90, 440 | −44, 940 |
| Bureau of Animal Industry: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Animal husbandry | 1, 136, 500 | 1, 305, 500 | 1, 305, 500 | +169, 000 | |
| Diseases of animals | 1, 000, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | +45, 000 | |
| Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease | 6, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | | |
| Inspection and quarantine | [9] 1, 400, 000 | 1, 340, 000 | 1, 225, 197 | −174, 803 | −114, 803 |
| Meat inspection | 10, 400, 000 | 11, 140, 000 | [10] 5, 000, 000 | −5, 400, 000 | −6, 140, 000 |
| Virus Serum Toxin Act | 340, 000 | 340, 000 | 290, 000 | −50, 000 | −50, 000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 21, 026, 500 | 21, 920, 500 | 15, 615, 697 | −5, 410, 803 | −6, 304, 803 |

[9] Includes $141,000 appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.

[10] To be established as a working capital fund for a meat inspection service which the committee bill would place on a completely self-supporting basis.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Bureau of Animal Industry—Continued | | | | | |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | [11] $9, 000, 000 | $100, 000 | $100, 000 | −$8, 900, 000 | |
| Reappropriation | 305, 000 | | | −305, 000 | |
| Total, eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | 9, 305, 000 | 100, 000 | 100, 000 | −9, 205, 000 | |
| Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum [12] | [42, 500] | [43, 000] | [43, 000] | [+500] | [ ] |
| Total, including reappropriation | 30, 331, 500 | 22, 020, 500 | 15, 715, 697 | −14, 615, 803 | −$6, 304, 803 |
| Deduct reappropriation | 305, 000 | | | −305, 000 | |
| Total, Bureau of Animal Industry, excluding reappropriation | 30, 026, 500 | 22, 020, 500 | 15, 715, 697 | −14, 310, 803 | −6, 304, 803 |
| Bureau of Dairy Industry (salaries and expenses) | [13] 1, 093, 812 | 1, 136, 000 | 1, 011, 000 | −82, 812 | −125, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| Field crops | 2, 663, 300 | 2, 784, 000 | 2, 784, 000 | +120, 700 | |
| Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops | 2, 245, 300 | 2, 445, 000 | 2, 445, 000 | +199, 700 | |
| Forest diseases | 407, 600 | 440, 000 | 359, 280 | −48, 320 | −80, 720 |
| Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation | 1, 500, 000 | 1, 541, 000 | 1, 391, 000 | −109, 000 | −150, 000 |
| Agricultural engineering | 637, 000 | 637, 000 | 637, 000 | | |
| National Arboretum | 85, 900 | 761, 000 | 436, 900 | +351, 000 | −324, 100 |
| Total | 7, 539, 100 | 8, 608, 000 | 8, 053, 180 | +514, 080 | −554, 820 |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Insect investigations | 2, 949, 500 | 3, 150, 000 | 2, 961, 300 | +11, 800 | −188, 700 |
| Insect and plant disease control | 3, 351, 600 | 3, 467, 000 | 2, 697, 100 | −654, 500 | −769, 900 |
| Foreign plant quarantines | 1, 742, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | +258, 000 | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 8, 043, 100 | 8, 617, 000 | 7, 658, 400 | −384, 700 | −958, 600 |
| Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases | 2, 800, 000 | 2, 800, 000 | 2, 050, 000 | −750, 000 | −750, 000 |
| Total | 10, 843, 100 | 11, 417, 000 | 9, 708, 400 | −1, 134, 700 | −1, 708, 600 |
| Tussock moth control | 395, 000 | (14) | (14) | −395, 000 | |

[11] Appropriated by H. J. Res. 154, 80th Cong. (Public Law 22); available until June 30, 1948.
[12] Transfer from the appropriation made by Sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933.
[13] Includes $10,000 appropriated in third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.
[14] Balance of this appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1947.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Agricultural chemical investigations | $511, 500 | $511, 500 | $511, 500 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Naval stores investigations | [15] 152, 550 | 152, 550 | 152, 550 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Regional research laboratories | 4, 920, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | +$80, 000 | ---------- |
| Total | 5, 584, 050 | 5, 664, 050 | 5, 664, 050 | +80, 000 | ---------- |
| Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (salaries and expenses) | 1, 007, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | +38, 000 | ---------- |
| White-pine blister-rust control: | | | | | |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine | 2, 754, 111 | 1, 443, 350 | 1, 193, 350 | −1, 560, 761 | −$250, 000 |
| Forest Service | 2, 599, 471 | 1, 974, 650 | 1, 974, 650 | −624, 821 | ---------- |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of the Interior | 646, 418 | 582, 000 | 582, 000 | −64, 418 | |
| Total | 6, 000, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | 3, 750, 000 | −2, 250, 000 | −250, 000 |
| Forest Service: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| General administrative expenses | 682, 000 | 682, 000 | 650, 000 | −32, 000 | −32, 000 |
| National forest protection and management | [16] 24, 496, 000 | 25, 310, 000 | 23, 764, 891 | −731, 109 | −1, 545, 109 |
| Fighting forest fires | [17] 4, 044, 000 | 100, 000 | 100, 000 | −3, 944, 000 | |
| Forest and range-management investigations | 2, 630, 000 | 2, 675, 000 | 2, 475, 000 | −155, 000 | −200, 000 |
| Forest products | 1, 555, 000 | 1, 555, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | −555, 000 | −555, 000 |
| Forest-resources investigations | 1, 072, 000 | 1, 072, 000 | 572, 000 | −500, 000 | −500, 000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 34, 479, 000 | 31, 394, 000 | 28, 561, 891 | −5, 917, 109 | −2, 832, 109 |
| Forest-fire cooperation | 8, 300, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | +700, 000 | |
| Farm and other private forestry cooperation | 809, 500 | 809, 500 | 809, 500 | | |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests | [16] 2, 590, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | 500, 000 | −2, 090, 000 | −500, 000 |
| Acquisition of lands from national forest receipts | 142, 000 | 142, 000 | 142, 000 | | |

[15] For comparability with the Budget estimate, excludes $3,450 proposed transfer in 1948 to the appropriation "Crop and livestock estimates," Bureau of Agricultural Economics (naval stores statistics work).

[16] These figures reflect a transfer of $410,000 from "Acquisition of lands for national forests" to "National forest protection and management" (for timber sales work) as authorized by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[17] Includes $3,944,000 appropriated by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the usual fire-fighting deficiency requirements.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Forest Service—Continued | | | | | |
| Control of tree insect epidemics, national forests | $282, 500 | (18) | (18) | −$282, 500 | |
| Total, Forest Service | 19 46, 603, 000 | 19 $42, 345, 500 | 19 $39, 013, 391 | −7, 589, 609 | −$3, 332, 109 |
| Forest roads and trails: | | | | | |
| Forest highways | 13, 714, 222 | 11, 300, 000 | 5, 300, 000 | −8, 414, 222 | −6, 000, 000 |
| Forest development roads | 12, 500, 000 | 12, 500, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | −2, 500, 000 | −2, 500, 000 |
| Total, forest roads and trails | 26, 214, 222 | 23, 800, 000 | 15, 300, 000 | −10, 914, 222 | −8, 500, 000 |
| Flood Control | 20 2, 100, 000 | 20 500, 000 | 20 500, 000 | −1, 600, 000 | |
| Soil Conservation Service: | | | | | |
| Soil conservation research | 1, 423, 000 | 1, 423, 000 | 673, 000 | −750, 000 | −750, 000 |
| Soil conservation operations | 43, 300, 000 | 43, 437, 000 | 38, 000, 000 | −5, 300, 000 | −5, 437, 000 |
| Total, Soil Conservation Service | 44, 723, 000 | 44, 860, 000 | 38, 673, 000 | −6, 050, 000 | −6, 187, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (title III, Farm Tenant Act) | [21] 1, 559, 000 | [21] 3, 260, 000 | [21] 1, 600, 000 | +41, 000 | −1, 660, 000 |
| Water conservation and utilization projects | [13] 700, 000 | ([22]) | ([22]) | −700, 000 | |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | | | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation (excludes special seed program) | 259, 246, 000 | 201, 720, 000 | 174, 199, 246 | −85, 046, 754 | −27, 520, 754 |
| Special seed program | 12, 500, 000 | | | −12, 500, 000 | |
| Reappropriation from sec. 32 balances | 42, 500, 000 | | | −42, 500, 000 | |
| Transfer from 1948, sec. 32 funds | | 100, 000, 000 | ([23]) | | [23] −100, 000, 000 |
| Total | 314, 246, 000 | 301, 720, 000 | 174, 199, 246 | −140, 046, 754 | −127, 520, 754 |
| Deduct reappropriation and transfer | −42, 500, 000 | −100, 000, 000 | | −42, 500, 000 | [23] −100, 000, 000 |
| Total, conservation and use, excluding reappropriation and transfer | 271, 746, 000 | 201, 720, 000 | 174, 199, 246 | −97, 546, 754 | −27, 520, 754 |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item: | | | | | |
| National and State expenses (1947 amount includes provision for pay costs under Public Law 390) | [8, 871, 868] | [9, 095, 868] | [3, 095, 868] | [−5, 776, 000] | [−6, 000, 000] |

[13] Includes $10,000 appropriated in third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.
[18] Balance of the appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1947.
[19] In addition, permanent appropriations are available as indicated at the end of this table.
[20] In addition, prior year balances are available for use.
[21] In addition, a permanent appropriation is available as indicated at the end of this table.
[22] To be financed in 1948 from prior year balance (*estimated* in the Budget at $1,042,576).
[23] The committee bill recommends rescission of the full amount of the sec. 32 appropriation for 1948.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item—Continued | | | | | |
| County associations | [$20, 039, 088] | [$24, 489, 088] | [$20, 489, 088] | [+$450, 000] | [−$4, 000, 000] |
| Total, administrative expense limitation | [28, 910, 956] | [33, 584, 956] | [23, 584, 956] | [−5, 326, 000] | [−10, 000, 000] |
| Sugar Act | 53, 500, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | +1, 500, 000 | ---------- |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32 funds): | | | | | |
| Reappropriation | 65, 568, 710 | ---------- | ---------- | −65, 568, 710 | ---------- |
| National School Lunch Act | [24] 81, 000, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | 45, 000, 000 | −36, 000, 000 | −30, 000, 000 |
| Deduct transfer in 1947 from sec. 32 funds | −75, 000, 000 | ---------- | ---------- | −75, 000, 000 | ---------- |
| Total, National School Lunch Act, excluding transfer | 6, 000, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | 45, 000, 000 | +39, 000, 000 | −30, 000, 000 |
| Administration of marketing agreements and orders | (25) | (25) | 525, 300 | +525, 300 | +525, 300 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing services: | | | | | |
| Market news service | 1,450,972 | 1,520,000 | 1,520,000 | +69,028 | |
| Market inspection of farm products | 596,000 | 712,000 | 712,000 | +116,000 | |
| Marketing farm products | 2,511,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,000,000 | −1,511,500 | −400,000 |
| Tobacco Acts | 1,344,000 | 1,552,000 | 1,552,000 | +208,000 | |
| Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency and Standard Container Acts | 239,800 | 294,000 | 294,000 | +54,200 | |
| Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | | |
| United States Grain Standards Act | 1,055,000 | 1,128,000 | 1,128,000 | +73,000 | |
| United States Warehouse Act | 640,000 | 685,000 | 585,000 | −55,000 | −100,000 |
| Federal Seed Act | 152,500 | 152,500 | 152,500 | | |
| Packers and Stockyards Act | 519,700 | 528,000 | 528,000 | +8,300 | |
| Naval Stores Act | 38,100 | 41,000 | 41,000 | +2,900 | |
| Insecticide Act | 293,500 | 293,500 | 293,500 | | |
| Freight rates for farm products | 138,000 | 138,000 | 138,000 | | |
| Total, marketing services | 10,378,072 | 9,843,000 | 9,343,000 | −1,035,072 | −500,000 |
| Supply and distribution of farm labor | [26] 12,000,000 | | | −12,000,000 | |

[24] Included $6,000,000 appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[25] Included under the sec. 32 permanent appropriation which the committee bill rescinds for 1948; new appropriation item is recommended to provide for administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

[26] Appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (calendar year appropriation; presently available until December 31, 1947 under the terms of Public Law 40, 80th Cong., which also provides for liquidation of the program within 30 days thereafter.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Commodity Exchange Authority: | | | | | |
| Commodity Exchange Act | $521, 000 | $650, 000 | $530, 000 | +$9, 000 | −$120, 000 |
| Farmers Home Administration: | | | | | |
| Farm tenant loans | 50, 000, 000 | 35, 000, 000 | 25, 000, 000 | −25, 000, 000 | −10, 000, 000 |
| Production and subsistence loans | [27] 95, 611, 282 | 90, 000, 000 | 60, 000, 000 | −35, 611, 282 | −30, 000, 000 |
| Farm tenant mortgage insurance fund | | 15, 000, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | +5, 000, 000 | −10, 000, 000 |
| Salaries and expenses | [28] 34, 428, 300 | 30, 000, 000 | 25, 000, 000 | −9, 428, 300 | −5, 000, 000 |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration | 180, 039, 582 | 170, 000, 000 | 115, 000, 000 | −65, 039, 582 | −55, 000, 000 |
| *Deduct*— | | | | | |
| Reappropriations | −25, 410, 582 | | | +25, 410, 582 | |
| RFC loan authorizations | −120, 000, 000 | | | +120, 000, 000 | |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration, direct appropriations | 34, 629, 000 | 170, 000, 000 | 115, 000, 000 | +80, 371, 000 | −55, 000, 000 |
| Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas | 1, 750, 000 | 1, 750, 000 | 1, 750, 000 | | |
| Rural Electrification Administration: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 5, 550, 000 | 5, 600, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | −1, 550, 000 | −1, 600, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loans: | | | | | |
| Loan authorization | 250, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −25, 000, 000 | |
| Direct appropriation | | 25, 000, 000 | | | −25, 000, 000 |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration | 255, 550, 000 | 255, 600, 000 | 229, 000, 000 | −26, 550, 000 | −26, 600, 000 |
| Deduct loan authorization | −250, 000, 000 | −225, 000, 000 | −225, 000, 000 | +25, 000, 000 | |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration direct appropriation | 5, 550, 000 | 30, 600, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | −1, 550, 000 | −26, 600, 000 |
| Farm Credit Administration (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | 584, 000 | 561, 000 | 561, 000 | −23, 000 | |
| Assessments against member institutions of the farm credit system | [29] 2, 680, 090 | [29] 2, 781, 000 | [29] 2, 781, 000 | +100, 910 | |
| Transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans" | [102, 015] | [ ] | [ ] | [−102, 015] | [ ] |
| Total, Farm Credit Administration, direct appropriations | 3, 264, 090 | 3, 342, 000 | 3, 342, 000 | +77, 910 | |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, and transfers from permanent appropriations (title I) | 1, 211, 243, 503 | 1, 110, 811, 608 | 828, 298, 822 | −382, 944, 681 | −282, 512, 786 |

[27] Consists of funds originally made available for rural rehabilitation and crop-production and harvesting loans which were combined pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946. A portion of the total represents estimated collections during fiscal year 1947; thus the figure is subject to revision based on actual collections.

[28] Consists of funds originally made available for expenses in connection with the rural rehabilitation, farm tenant, and crop-production and harvesting loan programs, which have been reorganized and integrated under the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946.

[29] Estimated assessments. Subject to revision.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE II.—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: | | | | | |
| Operating expenses (appropriation) | $7, 790, 000 | $9, 330, 000 | $2, 000, 000 | −$5, 790, 000 | −$7, 330, 000 |
| Appropriation for use of Secretary of Treasury in subscribing to capital stock | [30] 20, 000, 000 | [31] 10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | −10, 000, 000 | ---------- |
| Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 12, 000, 000 | −15, 790, 000 | −7, 330, 000 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation (limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds) | [8, 760, 000] | [[32] 8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [----------] |
| Total appropriations (title II) | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 12, 000, 000 | −15, 790, 000 | −7, 330, 000 |
| Totals: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriations | 660, 249, 211 | 805, 141, 608 | 615, 298, 822 | −44, 950, 389 | −189, 842, 786 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | ---------- | ---------- | −133, 784, 292 | ---------- |
| Loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −145, 000, 000 | ---------- |
| Transfer of funds from permanent appropriations | 75, 000, 000 | 100, 000, 000 | ---------- | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds | [8, 760, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [ ] |
| Grand totals, excluding net permanent appropriations | 1, 239, 033, 503 | 1, 130, 141, 608 | 840, 298, 822 | −398, 734, 681 | −289, 842, 786 |
| Add net total for permanent appropriations shown in table following | 52, 747, 348 | 58, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −42, 317, 638 | −48, 000, 000 |
| Grand totals, including permanents | 1, 291, 780, 851 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 850, 728, 532 | −441, 052, 319 | −337, 842, 786 |
| Deduct transfers authorized to be made between existing appropriations to meet pay costs under Public Law 390, 79th Cong | −17, 094, 800 | | | −17, 094, 800 | |
| Grand totals (net) | 1, 274, 686, 051 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 850, 728, 532 | −423, 957, 519 | −337, 842, 786 |

[30] Contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. Originally submitted as a 1948 budget estimate "to be immediately available."

[31] Additional recommendation contained in H. Doc. 214, 80th Cong.

[32] Represents a revision of the original estimate (see H. Doc. 186, 80th Cong.).

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

**PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS**

[NOTE.—Includes figures on funds recommended for rescission in title III of the accompanying bill]

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Cooperative agricultural extension work | $4, 704, 710 | $4, 704, 710 | $4, 704, 710 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Payments to States and Territories from national forest fund | [33] 3, 425, 000 | [33] 3, 950, 000 | 3, 950, 000 | +$525, 000 | ---------- |
| Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national forest fund | [33] 39, 000 | [33] 39, 000 | 39, 000 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Roads and trails for States, national forest fund | [33] 1, 370, 000 | [33] 1, 580, 000 | 1, 580, 000 | +210, 000 | ---------- |
| Payments to counties, submarginal land program | [33] 156, 000 | [33] 156, 000 | 156, 000 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Section 32 funds (see deductions below) | 118, 052, 638 | [33] 148, 000, 000 | ([34]) | −118, 052, 638 | [34] −$148, 000, 000 |
| Total, permanent appropriations | 127, 747, 348 | 158, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −117, 317, 638 | −148, 000, 000 |
| Deduct transfers from sec. 32 funds to "National School Lunch Act" in 1947 and to "Conservation and use" in 1948 | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 | ---------- | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 |
| Net total for permanents, excluding transfers | 52, 747, 348 | 58, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −42, 317, 638 | −48, 000, 000 |

## REAPPROPRIATIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | $305, 000 | | | −$305, 000 | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | 42, 500, 000 | | | −42, 500, 000 | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (Section 32 funds) | [33] 65, 568, 710 | | | −65, 568, 710 | |
| Farmers' Home Administration | [33] 25, 410, 582 | | | −25, 410, 582 | |
| Total, reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | | | −133, 784, 292 | |

## LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farm tenancy loans | $50, 000, 000 | | | −$50, 000, 000 | |
| Production and subsistence loans | 70, 000, 000 | | | −70, 000, 000 | |
| Rural electrification loans | 250, 000, 000 | $225, 000, 000 | $225, 000, 000 | −25, 000, 000 | |
| Total loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −145, 000, 000 | |

[33] Preliminary figures. Subject to revision.
[34] Committee bill recommends rescission of the full amount of this permanent appropriation for 1948.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

TRUST FUNDS

| Item | Appropriations, 1947[35] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Forest Service: | | | |
| Cooperative work | $3, 500, 000 | $3, 500, 000 | |
| Construction of forest access roads to standing timber | 11, 300, 000 | | −$11, 300, 000 |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | |
| Moisture content and grade determinations | 1, 354, 000 | 1, 354, 000 | |
| Indemnity fund, county associations | 2, 000 | 2, 000 | |
| Undistributed cotton price-adjustment payments | 300 | 300 | |
| Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products | 5, 600, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | −600, 000 |
| Grading of agricultural commodities | 800, 000 | 754, 000 | −46, 000 |
| Farmers' Home Administration: | | | |
| Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects | 55, 000 | | −55, 000 |
| State rural rehabilitation corporation funds | 9, 250, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | −250, 000 |
| Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts | 100, 000 | 50, 000 | −50, 000 |
| Miscellaneous contributed funds | 159, 530 | 229, 000 | +69, 470 |
| Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps | 2, 914 | 2, 600 | −314 |
| Unearned fees and other charges, unclaimed moneys, etc | 200 | 200 | |
| Total, trust accounts | 32, 123, 944 | 19, 892, 100 | −12, 231, 844 |

[35] Figures in several cases are preliminary and subject to revision based on actual amounts finally made available for the year.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JOHN PHILLIPS

Having signed the majority report of this committee, I submit these additional views to emphasize the need for economy and efficiency in the Department of Agriculture. The farmers of this Nation have said unmistakenly that they want economy in government, and a balanced budget. I think they mean they want economy and efficiency in the department most closely related to agriculture, as well as in other departments which are related only indirectly to agriculture. The farmers have insistently said for years that they wanted the elimination of the duplications and the confusions of Government departments and agencies.

The appropriation bill, for the Department of Agriculture, is a step toward the end the farmers want. It could have been a longer step. There are units of this Department which requested, in the present budget, three or four times as large appropriations as they received 10 years ago, yet whose services to agriculture generally are less essential today than they were previously. Some such agencies have been cut, in this budget, as little as 15 percent.

There are constant duplications, in the work of various units, throughout the Department. It is difficult for the Committee on Appropriations to do very much about this. It is an administrative job. I strongly urge this upon the Secretary as a problem of first importance. The intent of the Secretary will soon be determined by the application of the cuts taken in this budget. If these are applied only at the lower levels, leaving the Washington levels top-heavy and duplicating, it may be necessary for the Congress, through its proper committees, to attempt the necessary corrections. Several of us on the subcommittee believe that an additional cut in personnel could have been made, specifically applied to the Washington level. Statements that a department "ought to be reorganized," or insistence that "we must remove duplications," and similar comments frequently heard in committees and on the floor, are worthless as long as we continue to appropriate more money than a careful analysis indicates is required by the Department.

The problems of marketing research; of whether the Federal Government or the States should pay the costs of school lunches, or in what proportion; of the REA, or the AAA, or the SCS, or the CCC, will be discussed on the floor of the House during general debate on this bill. In brief, my feeling is that more money could have been cut from the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture and that, properly administered, the results would have benefited agriculture generally. My desire is to see a well-organized Department of Agriculture, with all the money it needs to operate efficiently, but without duplications or unnecessary activities, functioning primarily in the interest of the farmers of the United States of America.

## SUPPLEMENTARY VIEWS OF H. CARL ANDERSEN

I have concurred in the majority report with the following reservations:

A major portion of the cuts effected have been obtained through the reduction in appropriations for AAA, the school-lunch program and the Farm Home Administration, together with reductions of a lesser degree in REA, Research, Forestry, and other branches.

I do not feel that proportionate cuts in personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture have been made consistent with those above-mentioned.

It is my intention to offer on the floor, after careful study, certain amendments designed to secure the balance which is desirable.

H. Carl Andersen.



O

**NOTICE:** This bill is given out subject to release when consideration of it has been completed by the Whole Committee. Please check on such action before release in order to be advised of any changes.

# [FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

## Union Calendar No.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R.

[Report No. ]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 23, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

# A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

1 PENALTY MAIL

2 For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of
3 the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944
4 (39 U. S. C. 321d), $3,186,000.

5 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

6 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including
8 in addition to the objects for which funds are available for
9 such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bank-
10 head-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration,
12 planning, and coordination of research under section 10
13 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary
14 expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the
15 Act, as follows:

16 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
17 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9
18 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
19 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $3,000,000, of
20 which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be
21 transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research
22 on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching
23 requirement;

24 For research on utilization and associated problems
25 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, $1,000,000;

1 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
2 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
3 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act $1,000,000;
4 For the improvement and development, independently or
5 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
6 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
7 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
8 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
9 14, 1946), $1,000,000;
10 In all, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That such sums as may
11 be necessary for penalty mail as required by the Act of June
12 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular departmental
13 appropriation therefor: *Provided further*, That for necessary
14 printing and binding there may be transferred to, and made
15 a part of, the item "Printing and binding, Department of
16 Agriculture," such sums as are necessary: *Provided further*,
17 That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office,
18 or agency of the Department such amounts from this appro-
19 priation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for
20 which it is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition
21 to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other
22 appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*,
23 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work
24 relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

1 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

2 For necessary expenses, including personal services
3 in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues
4 for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service,
5 $2,425,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
6 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
7 in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
8 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be deter-
9 mined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000
10 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation;
11 and there may be expended for personal services in the
12 District of Columbia not to exceed $1,597,000: *Provided,*
13 *however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations
14 or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any
15 time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respec-
16 tively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts
17 transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appro-
18 priation and the amount which may be expended for per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased
20 or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
21 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
22 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
23 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases
24 in such appropriations or authorizations.

1 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
4 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
5 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
6 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
7 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
8 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
9 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
10 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
11 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
12 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
13 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
14 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
15 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
16 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
17 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
18 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
19 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
20 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
21 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-
22 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
23 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
24 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be

1 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
2 which may be expended for personal services in the District
3 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
4 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
5 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
6 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
7 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
8 tions: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that
9 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
10 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
11 of the various agencies of the Department can be more ad-
12 vantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
13 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
14 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
15 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
16 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
17 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
18 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in
19 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
20 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
21 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
22 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944
23 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
24 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
25 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*

1 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
2 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
3 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
4 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
5 Francisco radio office.

6 PRINTING AND BINDING

7 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
8 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
9 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
10 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
11 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
12 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
13 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
14 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
15 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
16 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
17 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
18 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
19 portion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out
20 under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Repre-
21 sentatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but
22 not including work done at the field printing plants of the
23 Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Print-
24 ing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919

1 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
2 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
3 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
4 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
5 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
6 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
7 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
8 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
9 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
10 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
11 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
12 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
13 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
14 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
15 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
16 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
17 for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
18 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such
19 sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in con-
20 nection therewith: *Provided further,* That the total amount
21 that may be transferred under the authority granted in the
22 preceding proviso shall not exceed $95,300.

23 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

24 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
25 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,

1 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
2 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
3 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
4 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
5 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
6 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
7 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

9 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
10 $1,887,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
11 ncluding the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per
12 annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books
13 of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

14 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
15 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
16 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
17 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation
18 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
19 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
20 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
21 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
22 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
23 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
24 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
25 their variations and trends, $1,743,600: *Provided,* That no

1 part of the funds herein appropriated or made available
2 to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading
3 "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county
4 land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for
5 the maintenance of regional offices.

6 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
7 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
8 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
9 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
10 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
11 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
12 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
13 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
14 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
15 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
16 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided,*
17 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-
18 able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or
19 publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
20 acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
21 production for other than the commercial crop.

22 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
23 RELATIONS

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the
25 Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling

1 the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the
2 Department in connection with foreign agricultural work,
3 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
4 not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $628,000.

5 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
6 COMMITTEES

7 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
8 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
9 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
10 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
11 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
12 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
13 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
14 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
15 thereto.

16 EXTENSION SERVICE

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO
18 RICO

19 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
20 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
21 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
22 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
23 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
24 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7

1 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
2 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
3 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
4 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
5 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
6 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
7 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
8 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
9 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
10 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
11 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
12 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
13 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
14 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
15 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 Administration and coordination of extension work:
18 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
19 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–
20 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
21 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
22 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
23 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
24 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

1 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

2 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
4 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
5 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
7 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
8 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
9 to the Department, from Government surplus without
10 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
11 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
12 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
13 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
14 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
15 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*
16 That the appropriation current at the time services are
17 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
18 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
19 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
20 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
21 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
22 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
23 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
24 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center

1 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
2 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
3 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
4 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
5 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
6 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
7 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
8 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
9 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
10 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
11 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
12 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
13 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
14 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
15 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
16 tor, whichever is greater.

17 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
18 AGRICULTURE

19 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
20 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
21 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
22 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
23 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
24 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by

1 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
2 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
3 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
4 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
5 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
6 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
7 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

8 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURE
9 MATERIALS

10 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
11 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
12 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
13 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
14 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
15 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
16 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of
17 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
18 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
19 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
20 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
21 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
22 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
23 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
24 $865,000.

1 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

2 To enable the Secretary, through such officers and
3 employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-
4 tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain
5 a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and
6 problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including
7 printing and binding, the employment of personal services
8 in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-
9 tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to
10 restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program
11 the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have
12 heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the
13 Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station
14 of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United
15 States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and
16 with other public and private agencies. The provisions of
17 this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of
18 the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take
19 such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine
20 to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-
21 under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use
22 of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds
23 of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including
24 its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than
25 any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-

1 poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable
2 continue the employment of the existing personnel of the
3 station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-
4 cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby
5 transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-
6 ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for
7 credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the
8 legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-
9 struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-
10 tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be
11 unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall
12 be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-
13 tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the
14 transfer.

15 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

16 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

17 For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico
18 to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the
19 provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
20 experiment stations:

21 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
22 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
23 C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
24 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
25 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administratian and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of

1 the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the
2 lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department
3 in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

4 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
5 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
6 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
7 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

8 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
11 $1,059,000 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
12 trict of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions of the Act,
13 as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and
14 related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the live-
15 stock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-
16 bearing animals, as follows:

17 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
18 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
19 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
20 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
21 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
22 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
23 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

24 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of

1 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
2 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.
3 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
4 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
5 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
6 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
7 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
8 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-
9 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
10 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
11 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
12 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
13 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
14 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
15 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
16 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That
17 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
18 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
19 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
20 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
21 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
22 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
23 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
24 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
25 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

1 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
2 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
3 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
4 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
5 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
6 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
7 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance
8 with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and
9 the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the in-
10 spection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
11 $1,225,197.

12 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
13 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products,
14 $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States
15 as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to
16 be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall
17 be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an ade-
18 quate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every
19 person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished
20 inspection or service under said laws, including inspection
21 of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export
22 and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products,
23 shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with
24 regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and
25 at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be

1 deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full
2 reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the
3 furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific
4 and technical investigations and laboratory services; investi-
5 gations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions
6 under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; super-
7 visory, administrative, statistical, business management, and
8 other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia
9 and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal
10 Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District
11 of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger
12 motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase
13 of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized
14 by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431);
15 and other necessary expenses: *Provided,* That the Secretary
16 of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of
17 bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the
18 interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-
19 draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges
20 or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-
21 ment: *Provided further,* That inspection or other technical
22 services may be rendered to Government and other public
23 agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein
24 provided: *Provided further,* That a schedule of obligations
25 and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the

1 close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for
2 the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the
3 Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*
4 *further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service
5 rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

6 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
7 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
8 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
9 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
10 factured in the United States and the importation of such
11 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
12 animals, $290,000.

13 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
14 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
15 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
16 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
17 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
18 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
19 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
20 services in the District of Columbia.

21 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
22 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

23 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-

1 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
2 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
3 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
4 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
5 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
6 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
7 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
8 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar
9 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
10 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
11 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
12 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
13 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
14 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
15 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
16 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
17 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
18 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
19 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
20 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
21 United States Government for any such animals shall not
22 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
23 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
24 appraisal is the same for each bird.

1 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

2 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
3 not to exceed $500,000 for personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act of
5 May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404), including investiga-
6 tions, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry,
7 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May
8 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or
9 renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946
10 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S.
11 C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process
12 or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

13 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICUTURAL
14 ENGINEERING

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
17 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
18 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
19 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
20 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
21 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
22 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
23 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
24 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-

1 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
2 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
3 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
4 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
5 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
6 as follows:

7 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-
8 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn,
9 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
10 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
11 field crops, $2,784,000.

12 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
13 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
14 tables, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
15 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
16 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
17 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
18 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
19 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
20 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
21 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
22 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dale
23 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
24 mately $7,000.

25 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest

1 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
2 control, $359,280.

3 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
4 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
5 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
6 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
7 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural
8 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
9 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
10 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
11 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
12 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
13 cropping and improved soil management; $1,391,000.

14 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
15 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
16 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
17 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
18 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
19 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
20 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
21 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
22 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

23 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
24 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
25 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.

1 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
2 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
3 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
4 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
5 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of
6 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act
7 of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

8 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
12 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means
13 of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agri-
14 culture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
15 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
16 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
17 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
18 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the
19 provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
20 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7
21 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
22 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and
23 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the
24 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
25 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-

1 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
2 and not to exceed $692,000 for personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, as follows:

4 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
5 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
6 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
7 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
8 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
9 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
10 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
11 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
12 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
13 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
14 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
15 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
16 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
17 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
18 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
19 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
20 tion, $2,961,300.

21 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
22 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
23 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
24 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,
25 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal

1 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
2 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
3 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
4 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
5 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
6 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
7 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
8 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
9 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
10 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
11 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
12 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
13 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $2,697,100: *Provided,* That
14 no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or
15 value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property
16 injured or destroyed: *Provided further,* That, in the discre-
17 tion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be
18 expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State
19 until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accom-
20 plish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or
21 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
22 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or
23 local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the
24 accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided further,* That in the
25 discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appro-

1 priation shall be made for applying methods of control of the
2 Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the re-
3 moval and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering
4 from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such
5 removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate
6 for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or
7 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
8 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or
9 local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations con-
10 cerned: *Provided, however,* That expenditures incurred for
11 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
12 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
13 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further,*
14 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
15 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
16 disease except where such trees are located on property
17 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
18 or on property included within local experimental control
19 areas.

20 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
21 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
22 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
23 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
24 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7

1 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
2 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
3 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
4 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
5 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
6 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
8 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
9 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
10 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
11 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

12 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
13 PLANT DISEASES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
16 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
17 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys
18 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
19 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
20 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to

1 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, as follows:
3 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
4 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
5 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
6 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
7 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
8 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
9 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
10 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
11 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
12 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
13 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
14 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
15 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
16 investigations; $511,500.
17 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
18 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
19 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
20 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
21 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
22 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.
23 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re-
24 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)

1 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
2 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
3 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
4 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
5 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
6 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

7 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
9 ing not exceed $381,700 for personal services in the District
10 of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the relative
11 utility and economy of agricultural products for food, cloth-
12 ing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions
13 of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of
14 such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
15 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
16 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
17 and for disseminating useful information on this subject,
18 $1,045,000.

19 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

20 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
21 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
22 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
23 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
24 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
25 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of

1 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
2 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
3 States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service
4 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
5 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
6 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
7 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
8 method development, and for operations conducted under
9 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to,
10 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
11 State and privately owned lands.

12 FOREST SERVICE

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
15 $1,055,378 for personal services in the District of Colum-
16 bia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to
17 the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act
18 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the
19 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-
20 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
21 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
22 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
23 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
24 be used for any experiment or test made outside
25 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of

1 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
2 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
3 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
4 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
5 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
6 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
7 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
8 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
9 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
10 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
11 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any
12 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
13 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
14 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
15 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
16 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
17 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
18 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil
19 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
20 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
21 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
22 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
23 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
24 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
25 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National

1 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
2 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
3 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
4 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
5 posters and related printed material, as follows:

6 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
7 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
8 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
9 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
10 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

11 National forest protection and management: For the
12 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
13 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
14 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
15 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
16 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
17 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
18 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to
19 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
20 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
21 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
22 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
23 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
24 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
25 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-

1 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
2 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
3 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
4 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
5 timber cultural operations; development and application
6 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
7 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
8 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
9 appraising of timber and other resources and development
10 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,
11 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
12 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
13 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
14 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
15 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
16 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
17 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
18 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or
19 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
20 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
21 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
22 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
23 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
24 $23,764,891, of whcih not to exceed $25,000 shall be
25 available for the purchase of one nursery site.

1 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
2 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
3 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
4 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
5 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
6 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

7 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
8 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
9 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
10 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
11 nance of improvements, as follows:

12 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
13 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
14 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
15 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
16 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
17 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
18 $2,475,000.

19 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
20 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
21 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,000,000, of which at least
22 $11,050 shall be expended for research in the utilization of
23 waste woods.

24 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest

1 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
2 under section 10, $572,000.

3 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

4 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
5 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
6 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
7 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
8 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
9 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
10 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

11 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

12 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
13 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
14 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
15 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
16 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
17 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
18 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
19 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and
20 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
21 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
22 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
23 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
24 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766),
25 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),

1 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
2 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
3 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
4 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
5 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
6 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
7 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
8 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
9 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

10 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

11 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
12 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
13 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $500,000, to be
14 available only for payment toward the purchase price of any
15 lands acquired.

16 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
17 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-
18 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
19 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
20 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
21 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
22 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
23 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
24 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
25 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;

1 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
2 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
3 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
4 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
5 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
6 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
7 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
8 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National
9 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
10 $35,000; in all $142,000.

11 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

12 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
13 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
14 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
15 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
16 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
17 Service administration, (1) $10,000,000 for forest develop-
18 ment roads and trails, and (2) $5,300,000 for forest high-
19 ways, which sums are authorized to be appropriated by
20 the Act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all,
21 $15,300,000 (including not to exceed $100,000 for per-
22 sonal services in the District of Columbia), to be imme-
23 diately available and to remain available until expended:
24 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
25 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings

1 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and
2 supplies used for road and trail construction and main-
3 tenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased,
4 altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not
5 exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building
6 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
7 $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year
8 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of
9 such building as certified by the Secretary.

10 FLOOD CONTROL

11 Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance
12 with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as
13 amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examina-
14 tions and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
15 $500,000, including personal services in the District of
16 Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain avail-
17 able until expended, with which shall be merged the un-
18 expended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or trans-
19 ferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided,*
20 That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of
21 lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds with-
22 out specific approval of the county board of supervisors of
23 the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided*
24 *further,* That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947
25 and 1948 for work of improvement on individual watersheds

1 shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Depart-
2 ment's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations
3 Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be
4 necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available
5 prior year balances.

6 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

7 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
8 the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
9 which provides for a national program of erosion control and
10 soil and water conservation, including not to exceed
11 $838,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
12 furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and main-
13 tenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or altera-
14 tion of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any
15 building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the
16 cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and
17 connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed
18 $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction
19 with land being purchased for other purposes and except for
20 eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed
21 $15,000 per building: *Provided further,* That no money
22 appropriated in this Act shall be available for the construc-
23 tion of any such building on land not owned by the Govern-
24 ment: *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where
25 the State has established a central State agency authorized

1 to enter into agreements with the United States or any of
2 its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
3 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
4 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
5 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
6 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
7 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
8 as follows:

9 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
10 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
11 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and
12 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
13 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
14 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
15 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all
16 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
17 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
18 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for con-
19 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental water-
20 sheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $673,000.

21 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
22 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
23 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
24 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
25 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation

1 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
2 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
3 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
4 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
5 in demonstration projects.

6 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
7 SUBMARGINAL LAND

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
9 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
10 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions
11 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
12 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
13 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

14 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
15 ADMINISTRATION

16 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
17 RESOURCES

18 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
19 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive,
20 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-
21 proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–
22 590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment
23 Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except
24 the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and
25 the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-

1 ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for
2 the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-
3 plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the
4 United States; $174,199,246, to remain available until De-
5 cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said
6 provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as
7 amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,
8 during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,
9 inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $23,584,956 of
10 the total sum provided under this head shall be available
11 during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-
12 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but
13 not more than $3,095,868 shall be transferred to the ap-
14 propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,
15 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*
16 That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available
17 for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment
18 Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of
19 February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or
20 expenses of any regional information employees or any
21 State or county information employees, but this shall not
22 preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-
23 tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds
24 shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses
25 in connection with the formulation or administration of any

1 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-
2 conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,
3 as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment
4 Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-
5 ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the
6 Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer
7 to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-
8 sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing
9 payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such
10 amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
11 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
12 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
13 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
14 practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 programs
15 under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*
16 *further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make
17 payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-
18 ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated
19 pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-
20 tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-
21 tary determines that, because of induction into the armed
22 forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were
23 prevented from filing, applications for payment under any
24 such program during the period the applicable appropri-

1 ation for such program was available for obligation,
2 such payments to be made out of the unobligated
3 balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use
4 of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of
5 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*
6 That an application for payment on the prescribed form is
7 filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in
8 case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer
9 under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the
10 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7
11 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the
12 date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December
13 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That
14 no part of any funds available to the Department, or
15 any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting
16 a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal
17 year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any
18 person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled
19 "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved
20 August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in
21 accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of
22 July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or
23 attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of
24 Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services

1 or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a
2 Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or
3 appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-
4 ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*
5 *further,* That where farmer participation in the program
6 in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full
7 amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or
8 sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to
9 States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have
10 not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

11 SUGAR ACT

12 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
14 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
15 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of
16 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
17 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)
18 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
19 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

20 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

21 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions
22 of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public
23 Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this
24 appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources
25 within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

1 ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING
2 AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

3 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
4 administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
5 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including
6 personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

7 MARKETING SERVICES

8 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $2,-
9 211,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in
10 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
11 as follows:

12 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
13 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
14 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
15 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
16 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
17 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their
18 products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other
19 agricultural products, $1,520,000.

20 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
21 tions and certification in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
22 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
23 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,
24 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
25 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when

1 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
2 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
3 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
4 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
5 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
6 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
7 service rendered, $712,000.

8 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
9 among the people of the United States useful information
10 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
11 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
12 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
13 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
14 ards of classification of American farm and food products
15 throughout the world for making analyses of cotton fiber as
16 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
17 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
18 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
19 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
20 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
21 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
22 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
23 600), and not to exceed $20,00 for transportation and
24 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
25 diem of persons serving without compensation while away

1 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
2 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
3 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make avail-
4 able to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department
5 such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary
6 to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is
7 made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts
8 transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation
9 items in this Act.

10 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
11 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
12 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
13 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
14 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection
15 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
16 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
17 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
18 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
19 $1,552,000.

20 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
21 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
22 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
23 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–
24 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
25 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.

1 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
2 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
3 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
4 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
5 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

6 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
7 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
8 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
9 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
10 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
11 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
12 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
13 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-
14 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
15 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

16 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
17 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
18 $1,128,000.

19 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
20 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

21 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
22 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
23 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation
24 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
25 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved

1 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
2 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
3 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
4 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
5 Congress.

6 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
7 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
8 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
9 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

10 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
11 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
12 91–99), $41,000.

13 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
14 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
15 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-
16 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
17 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
18 therein, $293,500.

19 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
20 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
21 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
22 $138,000.

23 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

24 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
25 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity

1 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
2 not to exceed $141,000 for personal services in the District
3 of Columbia, $530,000.

4 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

5 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
6 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
7 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
8 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
9 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
10 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
11 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

12 Loans: Title I and section 43, $25,000,000; title II,
13 $60,000,000; in all for loans $85,000,000.

14 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the
15 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
16 $5,000,000.

17 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
18 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
19 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
20 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
21 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
22 $25,000,000.

23 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
24 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
25 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-

1 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
2 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
3 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
4 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
5 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
6 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
7 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
8 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
9 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
10 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
11 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-
12 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
13 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security
14 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
15 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
16 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
17 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
18 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
19 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
20 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
21 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary
22 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
23 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
24 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
25 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of

1 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
2 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
3 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
4 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
5 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
6 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
7 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
8 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
9 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
10 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
11 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

12 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
13 AREAS

14 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
15 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
16 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
17 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
18 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
19 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
20 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

21 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

22 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
23 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
24 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

25 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-

1 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
2 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
3 financial and credit reports, $4,000,000.

4 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
5 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
6 7 thereof, $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary
7 of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section
8 3 (a) of said Act.

9 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act
10 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
11 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

12 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
13 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
14 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
15 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
16 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
17 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
18 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
19 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
20 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may
21 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
22 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
23 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
24 Electrification Administration established by Executive
25 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid

1 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
2 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
3 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
4 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
5 foregoing provision: *Provided*, That such obligations in-
6 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
7 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
8 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
9 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity
10 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
11 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of
12 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
13 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
14 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
15 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
16 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
17 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
18 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
19 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
20 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the
21 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
22 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
23 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
24 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
25 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the

1 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
2 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
3 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
4 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
5 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
6 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
7 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
8 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
9 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions
10 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
11 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-
12 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
13 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
14 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
15 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
16 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
17 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
18 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
19 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is
20 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
21 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
22 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
23 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
24 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
25 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For

1 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
2 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
3 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
4 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
5 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
6 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
7 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
8 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
9 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

10 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
11 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall
12 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
13 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
14 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
15 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
16 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
17 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

18 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses including personal services in
21 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
22 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
23 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
24 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
25 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-

1 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
2 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
3 lower price than to others, payment for which may
4 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
5 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
6 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
7 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
8 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
9 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per
10 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
11 from their homes, without other compensation from the
12 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
13 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
14 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
15 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
16 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
17 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act
18 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
19 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
20 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
21 organizations as provided in said section.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
24 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
25 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,

1 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
2 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
3 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
4 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
5 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
6 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
7 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
8 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
9 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary
10 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
11 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-
12 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
13 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
14 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
15 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
16 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
17 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal
18 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
19 association serving the area.

20 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
21 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
22 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
23 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
24 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
25 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-

1 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
2 Department for which appropriations are made under such
3 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
4 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
5 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
6 Budget.

7 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
8 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
9 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
10 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
11 gency of persons in the field service of the Department
12 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
13 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
14 tural Relations.

15 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
16 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
17 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

18 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
19 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
20 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
21 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
22 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
23 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

24 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
25 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any

1 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
2 the United States or who is a member of an organization
3 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
4 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
5 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
6 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
7 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
8 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
9 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
10 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
11 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
12 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
13 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
14 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
15 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
16 Government of the United States by force or violence:
17 *Provided further,* That such administrative or supervisory
18 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
19 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
20 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
21 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
22 *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a
23 strike against the Government of the United States or who
24 is a member of an organization of Government employees
25 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of

1 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
2 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
3 Government of the United States by force or violence
4 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
5 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
6 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
7 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
8 more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the
9 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
10 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
11 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be con-
12 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
13 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
14 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
15 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
16 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
17 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
18 templated by this section.

19 SEC. . This Act may be cited as the "Department of
20 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

21 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

22 SEC. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
23 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
24 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
25 year, namely:

1 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
2 expenses, $2,000,000, including not to exceed $700 for
3 newspapers.

4 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
5 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
6 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop
7 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
8 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
9 $10,000,000.

10 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
11 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
12 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
13 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
14 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
15 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation
16 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
17 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
18 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

19 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
20 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
21 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
22 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
23 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
24 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
25 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for

1 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
2 including legal and special services performed on a contract
3 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
4 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
5 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property
6 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
7 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
8 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
9 hereof.

10 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
11 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
12 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
13 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
14 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of
15 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
16 cotton, and flax.

17 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
18 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-
19 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
20 plicable to title II of this Act.

21 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

22 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF
23 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

24 The funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by
25 section 32, as amended, of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7

1 U. S. C. 612 (c)), are hereby rescinded effective July 1,
2 1947, and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered
3 into the Treasury immediately thereafter.

# INDEX


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of | 34 |
| Agricultural Economics, Bureau of | 11 |
| Agricultural Marketing Act, Administration of | 53 |
| Agricultural Research Administration | 15 |
| Alaska, research on agricultural problems of | 18 |
| Animal Industry, Bureau of | 21 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation | 70 |
| Commodity Exchange Authority | 57 |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | 48 |
| Dairy Industry, Bureau of | 27 |
| Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of | 30 |
| Experiment Stations, Office of | 19 |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities | 71 |
| Extension Service | 13 |
| Farm Credit Administration | 64 |
| Farmers' Home Administration | 58 |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | 70 |
| Farm tenancy | 58 |
| Flood control | 45 |
| Foreign Agricultural Relations, Office of | 12 |
| Forest roads and trails | 44 |
| Forest Service | 37 |
| General provisions | 65 |
| Government corporations | 69 |
| Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Bureau of | 36 |
| Information, Office of | 7 |
| International Production Control Committees | 13 |
| Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land | 48 |
| Library | 10 |
| Marketing services | 53 |
| Penalty mail | 4 |
| Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, Bureau of | 27 |
| Printing and binding | 9 |
| Production and Marketing Administration | 48 |
| Reduction in appropriation | 71 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | 4 |
| Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials | 17 |
| Rural Electrification Administration | 60 |
| School Lunch Act | 52 |
| Secretary of Agriculture, Office of | 2 |
| Soil Conservation Service | 46 |
| Solicitor, Office of | 6 |
| Special research fund, Department of Agriculture | 16 |
| Submarginal land, retirement of | 48 |
| Sugar Act | 52 |
| Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas | 60 |
| White pine blister rust control | 36 |

[FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

Union Calendar No.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R.

[Report No. ]

# A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DIRKSEN

MAY 23, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

80TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
*1st Session* } { No. 450

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

MAY 23, 1947.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3601]

The Committee on Appropriations presents herewith the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in the Budget on pages 257 to 380, and in House Documents Nos. 186 and 214 of the present session.

The bill as reported represents an over-all reduction of $383,427,742 below the over-all budget estimate of $1,188,571,318. It is below the over-all total for 1947 of $1,274,686,051 by the sum of $469,542,475. The sums referred to include direct appropriations, reappropriations (in 1947 only), loan authorizations, and the transfer and proposed transfers of funds of money from section 32 funds, being 30 percent of the customs receipts. The bill provides direct appropriations of $569,713,866 which is $235,427,742 below the budget estimate. Added to the reduction just indicated is $148,000,000 of the permanent appropriation under section 32, which the committee has rescinded in title III of the bill, makes a total reduction in annual and permanent appropriations, through action on this bill, of $383,427,742.

The increases and decreases above referred to are set out in the following statement:

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Direct appropriations | $660,249,211 | $805,141,608 | $569,713,866 | −$90,535,345 | −$235,427,742 |
| Reappropriations | 133,784,292 | | | −133,784,292 | |
| Loan authorizations | 370,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 225,000,000 | −145,000,000 | |
| Transfer of funds from permanent appropriations | 75,000,000 | 100,000,000 | | −75,000,000 | −100,000,000 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds | [8,760,000] | [8,450,000] | [8,450,000] | [−310,000] | [ ] |
| Grand totals, excluding net permanent appropriations | 1,239,033,503 | 1,130,141,608 | 794,713,866 | −444,319,637 | −335,427,742 |
| *Add* net total for permanent appropriations shown in table of permanent appropriations (p. 66) | 52,747,348 | 58,429,710 | 10,429,710 | −42,317,638 | −48,000,000 |
| Grand totals, including permanents | 1,291,780,851 | 1,188,571,318 | 805,143,576 | −486,637,275 | −383,427,742 |
| *Deduct* transfers authorized to be made between existing appropriations to meet pay costs under Public Law 390, 79th Cong | −17,094,800 | | | −17,094,800 | |
| Grand totals (net) | 1,274,686,051 | 1,188,571,318 | 805,143,576 | −469,542,475 | −383,427,742 |

Detailed tables of the several classes referred to in the above summary may be found on pages 48 to 68. At the end of this report there will also be found a table of the trust funds which will amount, in 1948, to $19,892,100.

## UNUSUAL INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1948

Never, within the recollection of the members of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations, has there been such interest in the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. Doubtless, there are many reasons. Since the termination of World War II, there has been speculation concerning the condition of agriculture in the postwar period, and the possibility of inheriting a surplus problem similar to that which obtained after World War I, in the early twenties and again in the early thirties. To be sure, there is always present that never-ending interest in the products of the soil on the part of the many agricultural constituencies which are represented in the House, and it is only natural that this annual supply bill should beget a broader interest than any other appropriation measure coming before the House.

In a single day, during the deliberations of the subcommittee, 116 witnesses, of whom 71 were Members of the House of Representatives, presented themselves to testify on some phase of this bill. An aggregate of departmental, congressional, and outside witnesses is in excess of 400 persons. There was a disposition on the part of the committee to hear every witness in order that a complete record might be made. Consideration of the bill up to the time when the report was completed and the bill presented to the whole Committee on Appropriations covered a period of more than 8 weeks, and should serve as persuasive evidence to the country of the amount of work that goes into the preparation of a measure of this kind.

*Back to primary sources.*

It is quite clear from the testimony which the committee received from all sources that there is today a new emphasis in agriculture. The accent is on research. It has become almost a household word in the whole domain of agriculture and is a healthy indication that, more and more, farmers and those identified with farm policy are becoming increasingly interested in what is commonly called the know-how of agriculture.

It is of more than passing interest that this new accent is like a revival of the sentiment which impelled the creation of this Department of Government. On May 15, 1862, the bill which established a Department of Agriculture in the Federal Government was signed by President Abraham Lincoln, and the 15th of May 1947 marked the eighty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the Department.

It is therefore meet and proper that the language of the original act be quoted here to indicate the reasons for the creation of the Department. That act recites in part, that:

> There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

The act goes on to define the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture and recites in part, that:

> The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence, and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power; he shall collect new and valuable seeds and plants, shall test, by cultivation, the value of such of them as may require such tests; shall propagate such as may be worthy of propagation; and shall distribute them among the agriculturists.

It must be obvious that the purpose of a Department of Agriculture was the conduct of research and the diffusion of its fruits among the farmers of the Nation. After the elapse of four score and five years it is interesting to note that once more the emphasis is on research and know-how, rather than upon action programs which may constitute an undue burden upon the Federal Treasury.

## GROWTH

We have come far since President Lincoln signed that bill in 1862. Like every agency of Government, the Department of Agriculture

was then quite small and the appropriations so modest that they would have caused scarcely any comment in this day when Congress and the country deal with astronomical sums. The growth and size of the Department today can be estimated from certain physical factors such as the space occupied and the number of personnel. In 1946 the Department occupied 1,458,482 square feet in Federal buildings in the District of Columbia, 68,451 square feet of rented space in the District of Columbia, 2,097,373 square feet in Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia, and 3,510,459 square feet of rented space outside the District of Columbia. It therefore occupies an aggregate of 7,134,765 square feet of office space, or a total of approximately 170 acres, in all parts of the country. This would doubtless exceed the fondest dreams that its creator ever entertained.

*General evaluation of the work*

The Department of Agriculture concerns itself with every function and activity which is of interest to the farmer and to a stable agriculture. It begins with the soil and the conservation of that soil as a natural resource which we hold in trust for future generations. It deals with the seed and the plants which go into the soil and which embody our hopes for a continued subsistence. It interests itself in farm buildings and more useful and convenient living for farm families and the housing of livestock and machinery. It encompasses the electrification of the farm and its beautification as an incentive for keeping young people on the land. Its activities follow the produce of the farm to the market where they are devoted to better distribution, to a better dissemination of information on prices and markets, and to a better knowledge of grading. It evidences an interest in both the domestic and foreign markets for the farmer's produce and for an expansion of those markets through diversion programs and new uses. It is obviously interested in the price which a farmer receives and concerns itself with economic devices, such as loans and price supports, in the interest of price stability and the equality of purchasing power for the farmer. Finally, it concerns itself also about farm credit, whether it be for conducting farm operations or for the purchase of a farm. All these come within the purview of the Department of Agriculture.

## WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

In appraising the needs of the Department for the next fiscal year and in orienting itself to the needs of agriculture for other years which lie ahead, the committee has given more and more attention and discussion to the question of Federal responsibility for agriculture and to what extent that responsibility should be borne by the Federal Government. It can scarcely be contended that the various States, most of which have comfortable bank balances as distinguished from the Federal Government with a $258,000,000,000 debt, and which derive profit and taxes from our farm domain and from farmers' incomes, do not have a stake in farmers' achievements and in the progress of agriculture.

Members of the committee, like all other Members of Congress, have carefully pondered the road down which agriculture shall travel. Shall it at long last be the paternalistic road along which there are subsidies and grants coupled with more and more direction from

Washington or shall we move back, in some degree at least, to the road set forth in the act signed by Abraham Lincoln, along which one may find the bench marks of research, the diffusion of useful knowledge, improved market news, the necessary supports and loans, and a larger degree of reliance upon the individual farmer. As we give thought to such a problem as soil conservation and to the saving of the surface of our land from the influences of erosion, we also have the responsibility of pursuing those policies that will prevent the erosion of that rugged individual character which has made the American farmer the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in any time or generation in the world's history.

### THE COMMITTEE APPROACH

When all is said and done the appropriation of funds must be geared to some kind of a basic philosophy.

The committee could follow the route of indiscriminate reductions for the purpose of effecting substantial economies but such a course might result in the serious crippling of essential functions or in nullifying the remainder of the appropriation carried for such an activity. On the other hand, the committee can follow a basic approach which preserves the essential functions, eliminates those which are not regarded as indispensable, and reduces waste, extravagance, and duplication with constant emphasis upon those research activities which in the judgment of the committee are regarded as essential.

Sometimes the elimination of a single man from a scientific bureau can destroy an essential step in an entire chain of scientific endeavor and thereby make the rest of the work fruitless or abortive or place it in a status which will only delay the ultimate result.

Many views were expressed by various witnesses to the effect that the farmer could not and would not do for himself some of those essential things which cannot be immediately measured in terms of cash. With this view the committee does not agree because it has too much confidence in the self-reliance and capacity of the American farmer.

The question of duplication was often in evidence and many protests concerning duplication of activities and facilities have come to the committee from time to time. The need for eliminating duplication was so well summed up by one farm leader who said in effect "Congress wouldn't think of having one rural carrier to deliver first-class mail, another rural carrier to deliver second-class mail and still a third rural carrier to deliver third-class mail over the same route." This was his way of expressing the need for consolidation of functions in the interest of a more efficient operation.

It was refreshing also to hear witness after witness reaffirm and reassert his interest in the need for economy. It was so well put by an humble but vigorous farm leader from Minnesota, who said in effect "We do not ask more money for soil conservation. We merely ask for more conservation for the same money." The committee, therefore, in its final deliberations on this bill followed the spirit of a phrase which is in common use in the Forestry Service. The foresters speak of "selective logging." The committee has endeavored in its consideration of this bill to effectuate "selective reductions" based upon the present condition of agriculture and the needs of the future.

## CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE

Every Member of Congress should read carefully the very excellent statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on the general condition of agriculture as a whole. It is a splendid report and evidences a condition never attained by agriculture in any country in any time or generation.

In that statement the Secretary points out that our farm domain was at the very pinnacle of production in 1946 with the greatest production in history. Between 1940 and 1946, the value of assets used in agriculture had increased from 53.7 billion to 101.6 billion, which is an increase of 89 percent in that period. The increase in the proprietor's equity in agriculture increased by 49.5 billion dollars or 113 percent. The value of cash and bonds in the hands of farmers jumped from 4.2 billion to 19 billion while on the other hand farmers' debts dropped from 10 billion to 8.3 billion. The value of farmers' livestock, equipment and inventories had increased by 63 percent and the value of farm lands by 68 percent. Here then, is unparalleled testimony to the splendid conditions of American agriculture.

## THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

Doubtless, this information was before the President when he compiled and presented his budget message to Congress on January 10, 1947. The President's observations are quite worthy of repetition. The President said, in part, referring to soil-conservation payments:

> A year ago the budget message recommended gradual reduction of these payments and that recommendation is now renewed. More than 60 percent of the total payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. Most of this money, thus, is being paid to a comparatively small number of farmers, who, because of their strong position in American agriculture would undoubtedly continue the best farm-management practices without the persuasion of a bonus from the Treasury.
>
> We should shift our effort from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service. I therefore propose that the appropriation act limit the conservation and use program for the crop year 1948 to $200,000,000 instead of the $300,000,000 program to which we are committed for the crop year 1947. This will not affect expenditures materially until the fiscal year 1949.

While the committee does not agree with the President concerning commitments in the crop year 1947, it cites this expression from the President to indicate that the Chief Executive has had in mind a shift of emphasis from subsidies to technical guidance on the ground that many farmers are in a strong position to continue sound farm practices without a bonus from the Federal Treasury.

This logic is in substantial accord with the viewpoint followed by the subcommittee in determining the various needs of agriculture for the fiscal year 1948. (See p. 23, post, for discussion of committee's action on the President's recommendation.)

## EXTENSION SERVICE

While the estimates for the Extension Service for the fiscal year 1948 total $23,660,150, only $827,200 of this estimated amount is for administrative expenses, the balance is distributed among the States

under various acts of Congress which go back to 1914 and are used at the State level.

In addition, the States participate in matching these funds to the extent of $25,669,716, so that the total funds available for this function from all sources will be $52,992,540.

It was at this point that the committee engaged in a long and earnest discussion concerning the duplication of many field activities of the Department and hoped to contrive a policy or a vehicle whereby these functions might be consolidated. The general limitations on an appropriation bill, however, stood in the way and the committee respectfully suggests to the Legislative Committee on Agriculture for the House of Representatives that this matter deserves immediate attention.

At the present time the Extension Service has on its rolls 10,419 persons consisting of State supervisors, specialists, county agents, home demonstration agents, boys' club agents, clerks and assistants, virtually all of whom operate at the field level and maintain close contact with farmers in disseminating the research fruits and the recommended practices of the Department.

At the same time the Soil Conservation Service in its field operation maintains 7 regional offices with 860 persons, 50 State offices with 419 persons, 550 district offices with 1,000 persons, and 2,268 work unit offices with 9,350 persons.

To this large field operation there must be added the Farmers Home Administration with a total of 8,100 persons operating at area, district, and county levels. It appears reasonably clear that there is both administrative and functional duplication in the field between these agencies and immediate steps should be taken to develop programs at county levels under unified management whereby substantial additional economies might be effected. The Extension Service was, therefore, left intact without a reduction.

## FOREST SERVICE

For fiscal 1948 there was an over-all estimate for the Forest Service of $66,145,500. It has become a vast domain of activity but that observation is not intended to convey the impression that forestry is not important. As a matter of fact, more and more, forestry is coming to be regarded as an annual crop with definite cash income benefits to farmers in all sections of the country. There is a growing interest in forestry as evidenced by the fact that more than threescore witnesses appeared to testify on one item or another in the Forest Service estimate.

The committee points out first of all that there has been no substantial increase in the acreage of the national forests since 1938.

There has been an undue emphasis on public relations by the Forest Service as evidenced by the fact that 114 persons are employed in informational and educational activities. Some of the projects for which funds were requested appeared highly nebulous in character and in some cases the work appeared to be rather academic.

On those items in which there was such broad public interest and for which there appear to be genuine justification, such as forest-fire cooperation and farm-forestry cooperation, the committee made no reductions. Nor did it reduce many of the field and research functions

which the Forestry Service presently pursues. It does, however, believe that the reductions which are tabulated below are fully justified and that there will be no impairment of the usefulness and the efficiency of the Forest Service.

### PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLICITY ACTIVITIES

It was reported to the committee by the Department that a total of approximately 500 persons were devoting approximately 340 man-years of work to "public relations and publicity activities."

The Department contends that all of such work is in connection with the "diffusion among the people of the United States of useful information on subjects connected with agriculture," as authorized in the basic act of 1862. Be that as it may, the word "useful" is a highly relative term. The members of the committee, as well as Members of the House generally, are constantly coming across publications and releases whose "usefulness" in connection with agriculture is of questionable degree. Many recipients of such publications or releases have mailed them to the committee or to Members of the House deploring the waste of public funds in their preparation and mailing.

It had been the purpose of the committee to reduce tc 250 man-years the amount of work permitted to be done under this head during the fiscal year 1948. However, it was found all but impossible to draft a provision in such terms as would not endanger the fundamental work of the Department in diffusing essential information pertaining to agriculture. The committee believes it is a matter which can be controlled by the more flexible device of administrative regulation, without injury to agriculture, and has decided to give the Department the opportunity to "reform itself." It is believed that under a purposeful and rigid supervision which will prescribe essentiality and a high degree of unquestionable "usefulness to agriculture" for all publicity and public relations activities, the Department should be able to achieve the purpose of the committee in effecting the reduction above indicated. Its success in so doing will be measured by the committee next year when it will call for a report of such activities for 1948, to be compared with the report submitted this session.

### BUREAU, DEPARTMENT, AND BUDGET BUREAU ESTIMATES

On page 197 of the hearings it will be observed that the total of all estimates presented to the Department by the various bureaus in the Department for the fiscal year 1948 was $1,611,961,683. These estimates were then canvassed by the departmental staff and reduced to $1,448,757,528. This then was the estimate presented to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget in turn thereupon recanvassed these estimates and finally reduced them to $1,198,571,318. These figures would indicate that by action of the Budget Bureau the estimates as originally submitted by the component agencies in the Department of Agriculture were reduced by more than $400,000,000 before they were presented to the Congress.

There follow somewhat more detailed discussions of the committee's action on the several budget requests.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses.*—In view of the substantial reductions made in the many action-program appropriations carried in the bill, the committee feels that the work of the Office of the Secretary will be substantially reduced. The budget estimate involves an increase of $118,350. Certain items among those increases have been approved by the committee as follows: Replacement of the official automobile for the use of the Secretary, $3,000; for the establishment of a health program for employees under the act of August 8, 1946, $45,000; and within-grade salary advancements, $26,850. The committee has made a reduction of $100,000 in the budget of $2,150,000 for this item in the belief that the increases above referred to can be provided for through administrative adjustments of the remaining objects of expenditure.

*Penalty mail.*—The budget estimate for penalty mail is in the sum of $3,686,000, which the committee has reduced by $500,000. Elsewhere in the bill the committee has eliminated the agricultural conservation payment program for 1948. The penalty mail allotment to the Production and Marketing Administration from this appropriation is in the sum of $1,746,491, of which $938,000 is estimated for use in connection with that program. It is obvious that the major portion of the latter sum would be expended in connection with planning and carrying out the program for 1948 and since that has been eliminated, the committee believes a cut of $500,000 in the penalty mail estimate can be made with entire safety.

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The budget includes an estimate of $19,000,000 for carrying into effect the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946, otherwise known as the Research and Marketing Act, or the Hope-Flannagan Act. The committee held exhaustive hearings with departmental witnesses on this estimate as well as from a large number of individuals and organizations. Since this is the first year of a very far-reaching program which is contemplated to increase in appropriations after 5 years to the level of approximately $61,000,000, the committee believes the launching of the program should be approached in the light of all research already being done that has a direct or indirect influence on marketing. It is to be noted, also, that the department itself does not, as yet, have a well-developed program embracing the appropriations requested, nor following the recommendations of the legislative committee's report of 1946.

The committee has been somewhat more liberal with respect to the amounts to be allotted to the land-grant colleges than with the other divisions of the program. As against a budget estimate of $5,000,000 for payments to the State experiment stations, the bill provides $3,000,000. For the remaining three projects under the act, the bill provides $1,000,000 for each, a total appropriation for the initial year of the act, of $6,000,000. The committee was impressed with the evidence given as to the importance and value of the Research and Marketing Act program, but believes that such a program should be clear of any charge of duplication and should reflect research truly in the direction of increasing the flow of agriculture products in com-

merce by projects designed to increase consumption. The Congress obviously contemplated an independent merchandising program, not a supplementary appendix to an existing production research program.

### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The budget estimate of $2,525,000 for the Office of the Solicitor has been reduced in the sum of $100,000. In view of the many substantial reductions in the program items throughout the bill which require the services of the Solicitor's office, the committee believes that it can function efficiently under the reduced expenditure and at the same time make the necessary within-grade salary promotions. The committee is of the opinion that an overhauling of the organizational set-up in the Solicitor's office whereby more legal talent can be devoted to actual legal work rather than supervision could effectuate additional economies in this office.

### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The budget estimate of $700,000 for salaries and expenses represents an increase of $38,950 over the appropriations for the current year. Of this increase, $10,950 is for within-grade salary advancements; $20,000 is for additional work in answering public and congressional requests for information; and $8,000 is for an increase in the accounting and auditing staff. It is in this office that much of the Department's publicity work is carried on. In applying the recommended reduction of $125,000 in this item, the Department will, of course, have in mind the considerations discussed above under the caption, "Public relations and publicity activities."

*Printing and binding.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,607,000 for printing and binding, which is an increase of $296,400 above the current appropriation. This increase is occasioned primarily by the recent advance in the cost of printing. It was reported to the committee that the purchasing power of the printing and binding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 and as proposed for 1948, is less than half that in any of the three fiscal years, 1940–42. These are factors beyond the control of the committee or of the Department, and the committee was unable to justify any reduction.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The committee has allowed the budget estimate of $2,375,400 for crop and livestock estimates, which is but $50 less than the estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1947. The committee believes the importance of the crop and livestock estimates cannot be overstressed. Economic investigations, to the contrary, do not enjoy the same confidence and esteem of the committee. It is believed that much of the work in the field of economic investigations is highly speculative in nature, economics being one of the least precise of the sciences, if, indeed, it may be dignified by that term. It is believed that the program of economic investigations may be drastically curtailed without any injury to the work of the Department, if the objectives of such investigations are carefully determined and made specifically applicable to work of the Department requiring such investigations. One

of the activities of the Department toward which the committee believes the studies of this agency should be directed is that of the new research and marketing program, the initial appropriation for which is being made in this bill. The committee has reduced the budget estimate of $2,493,600 in the sum of $750,000 and feels sure that in doing so it has not imposed any real injury upon agriculture. The committee was well impressed with the sincerity and the ability of the head of this office, namely, Mr. O. V. Wells, and appreciates his assurance given to the committee that he would endeavor to carry on the program within whatever sum the Congress shall appropriate.

### OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The budget estimate of $728,000, which is the amount available for the current year, has been cut in the sum of $100,000. As in the case of economic investigations, this activity occupies a field of somewhat indefinite boundaries. The committee feels sure that the work can be carried on under the reduced amount without injury to agriculture and it also believes that this appropriation is one where the work should be oriented toward the newly established marketing and research program. The committee was disposed to make a larger reduction in this amount and refrained from doing so only because of the possibility that foreign outlets for agricultural commodities may require additional emphasis in the fiscal year 1948.

### RESEARCH

In the research bureaus under the general administrative head of the Agricultural Research Administration, reductions were made in some of these projects on the ground that many of them had been in process for a good many years and should be terminated or brought to completion. The committee was of the opinion that some of the scientific talent in these Bureaus was scattered pretty thinly and that better results could be obtained by reducing the number of lines of work and concentrating upon certain selective activities that appeared of greater importance to agriculture as a whole. These reductions are in nowise intended to cripple scientific work but rather to concentrate it along the most useful lines in the interest of more expeditious results.

### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

*Office of the Administrator.*—Several years ago, the Secretary, by administrative order, established the Agricultural Research Administration, with an administrator, and staff, under whose supervision and direction the following research activities were grouped: Special Research Fund, Office of Experiment Stations, Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Dairy Industry, Bureau of Plant Industry, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, and the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. Under a recent administrative order, all other research activities of the Department have been brought under the supervision and control of the Office of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration. These include the research activities of the Forest Service, those of the Soil Conservation Service, and will

also include the Research on Strategic and Critical Materials, which is provided for elsewhere in the bill. In addition to the supervision of research, the Office of the Administrator controls and operates the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md. The center occupies an area of approximately 15,000 acres, of which 2,500 acres is used by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The value of the remaining acreage and the structures is estimated at about $13,000,000. The custodial function relating to the center is under the Office of the Administrator. This includes, of course, the care and maintenance of buildings, roadways, heating and lighting and the other usual custodial services. The several research bureaus of the Department carry on much of their basic fundamental research at the center up to the point where the application of the research in the various geographical sections of the country become operative and the work is then suitably allotted to the various regions. It is quite obvious that increased costs of labor by virtue of the 40-hour week and increased cost for feed and supplies has materially increased the operating cost of the research center at Beltsville and these additional costs must be taken into account.

### SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND

The budget estimate, $1,303,000, for the special research fund is in the amount of the current appropriation. Here the committee has imposed a cut of $100,000, which is to be applied to the special projects carried on by designation of the Secretary and not to the special research laboratories in the major agricultural regions. The committee believes that the program under this fund should also be oriented to the new activity under the research and marketing appropriation.

### STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The committee has provided the full amount of the budget estimate of $349,000 for the project authorized by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946, as such act may relate to natural rubber. Exhaustive hearings were held on this activity at which the committee heard witnesses from the Army and Navy Munitions Board respecting the military importance of this research as well as from the representatives of the Department of Agriculture under which the experiments relating to rubber production are to be carried on. The budget estimate breaks down into two separate parts under which $170,000 is to be spent for investigations to develop domestic sources of natural rubber from guayule and other rubber plants and $179,000 for investigations of improved methods for extracting and processing rubber from such plants. In view of the high security rating of this item and of the character of the testimony supporting it, the committee felt it would not be justified in making any reduction under the budget estimate and has therefore provided the full amount.

### RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

The bill carries this year, for the first time, a special appropriation for research on agricultural problems of Alaska. This Territory has come to occupy a very important place in the national establishment.

It is now, and may for some time continue to be, an important link in the chain of our national security.

The committee had the benefit of the testimony of witnesses representing the Secretary of War. They reported that the Army procurements of the products of Alaska farms amount to but 6.35 percent of the Army's total procurements, for use in Alaska, of the same products. Such commodities, when obtained from the States or other outside points are laid down in Alaska at materially increased costs and with appreciable losses in the nutritional quality of many of the products. These factors seriously affect the well-being of the military personnel, and in the case of a great national emergency might well constitute a disastrous defect in logistics. The committee believes that the importance of the availability of locally produced food and feed supplies for any military force is obvious.

It is reliably reported to the committee that a very substantial number of veterans have already gone to Alaska and that many more will do so in the years immediately ahead. Most of these have gone to Alaska with the view of taking up farming. They will need the guidance which can be supplied only as the result of careful research.

The group of Department of Agriculture research scientists which this committee sent to Alaska last summer for the purpose of a reconnaissance survey of the need for agricultural research in that Territory has submitted what is probably the most comprehensive report ever made (see hearings, pp. 1833 et seq.) of the possibilities of Alaska agriculture and the many complex problems relating thereto.

The committee is impressed with the importance of a program of agricultural research in that Territory of far greater scope than has heretofore been conducted under the comparatively modest Federal grants to the Territorial land-grant college. It is the firm conviction of the committee that the national aspects of this problem indicate that, for some years ahead, all agricultural research in the Territory should be carried on as a single integrated program under the sole administration and authority of the Federal Secretary of Agriculture, who is directly responsible to the Congress. The problem presented is of such grave national import that the integration suggested above becomes an imperative necessity.

To that end, the bill includes a single appropriaton of $144,940 for research on agricultural problems of Alaska (see p. 18 of the bill). This sum includes the amounts which otherwise would have been appropriated for the Territorial experiment station under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts. In addition, there is being made available the allotment to which the Territory would be entitled under the appropriation to carry out the Research and Marketing Act, approximating $12,000. The bill provides that the Territorial appropriations for the experiment station, together with all lands, buildings, equipment, and products now under the control of the station, shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture and by him used to carry out the program. Should the sale of products, the receipts from which are returned to the appropriation, equal that of several recent years, the total of funds available for this work in 1948 will be somewhat in excess of $200,000—more than double what it has been heretofore.

The Secretary of Agriculture will take over the station with a view to continuing, so far as consonant with the over-all integrated pro-

gram, the several lines of research in existence at the time of taking over. He will so plan and conduct the program provided for in the accompanying bill as to embrace, among others, projects suitable for carrying on under the regular land-grant college appropriations authorized by the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts; so that when the operation of the station is returned to the university, there will be possible an uninterrupted continuity of land-grant college research. The Secretary, during the period of his operations, will preserve and continue such mutually beneficial relations between the station and the university, such as the cooperative exchange of personnel and other facilities, as, in his judgment, will facilitate the development of a strong research program. In the sale of farm products resulting from research, he will give the university priority of opportunity to purchase, and upon terms deemed by him fair and reasonable in the premises.

It is expected that the Territory of Alaska will continue to make appropriations for the prosecution of the integrated program under the Federal management set up in the bill to the same extent such appropriations would be made under Territorial management of the station.

It is contemplated that the time will come when the Congress will determine that its interest in and responsibility for agricultural research in Alaska may be adequately discharged through the making of annual grants under the acts above referred to, at which time the program will revert to its former status of control and administration by the University of Alaska, and all lands, buildings, equipment, machinery, livestock, and products used in such research will revert to their original status.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1934, agricultural research in Alaska has been carried on exclusively by the Territorial experiment station under the University of Alaska from grants made to such station under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts, together with funds which have been appropriated by the Territorial Legislature. Including the annual Federal appropriation of $15,000, first made for the fiscal year 1931, the total of funds available for work by the experiment station from 1931 up to and including the fiscal year 1945 is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal appropriations | $343, 641. 50 |
| Territorial appropriations | 62, 000. 00 |
| Proceeds from sale of products | 168, 599. 20 |
| Total | 574, 240. 70 |

Previous to the time covered in the foregoing table, the Federal Department of Agriculture had for many years conducted agricultural research in a small way at various points in Alaska. In the appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, appropriations for Federal operation of research in Alaska were discontinued. Under the authority contained in said act, which was reported out by this committee, the Secretary of Agriculture transferred to the University of Alaska title to the lands comprising the experiment station, together with the buildings thereon. It is these lands, originally belonging to the Government and later donated to the Territory of Alaska, plus such lands, if any, which may since have been added thereto, which the accompanying bill makes

available for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the emergency program of research provided for in the bill.

It is not the purpose of the bill to divest the university or the experiment station of the title to the lands or other properties which are to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture. When the time, referred to above, arrives that the Congress shall deem its responsibility for agricultural research in Alaska will be adequately discharged through the regular Federal grants to the Territorial university, the Federal administration of the program will be withdrawn and that of the university authorities will be restored. It is the opinion of the committee that the station will then be returned to normal Territorial operation as a vastly improved set-up, which will redound greatly to the benefit of Alaskan agriculture and to the enhancement of the prestige of the university and the experiment station.

### OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

The budget estimate of $7,206,208 for payments to States and Territories is in the same amount as for the current fiscal year. The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate with the exception of $44,940, which is estimated for payment to Alaska. This amount has been included in the total appropriated for research on agricultural problems of Alaska heretofore mentioned (see immediately above). The budget estimate of $211,000 for administration of grants and coordination of research with States has been allowed. This represents an increase of $17,000 above the 1947 appropriation, of which $14,000 is to enable the office to overcome a backlog in publications work and $3,000 is on account of within-grade salary advancements.

*Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico.*—The committee has allowed the budget estimate of $114,700, which is a decrease of $62,500 represented by a nonrecurring item included in the act for last year to cover the cost of construction of improvements at the station.

### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

The following budget estimates have been approved, namely: Animal husbandry, $1,305,500, an increase of $169,000 above the current appropriation; diseases of animals, $1,045,000, representing an increase of $45,000 over 1947, and eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease, $6,750,000, the amount of the current appropriation. The budget estimate of $1,340,000 for Inspection and Quarantine has been cut in the sum of $114,803, of which $81,806 is applicable to the project for control of interstate shipment of livestock for the purpose of preventing the spread of communicable diseases and $32,997 to the project for supervision of the importation of hides, forage, etc. The budget estimate of $340,000 for the Virus Serum Toxin Act has been reduced in the sum of $50,000. In the view of the committee, the various serums have become fairly well standardized and do not now require the measure of supervision and control as formerly.

*Meat inspection.*—The budget carries an estimate of $11,140,000 for meat inspection, which is an increase of $740,000 above 1947, of which $240,000 is for within-grade salary advancements and $500,000 is for additional veterinarians and lay inspectors. The dispersion of the

meat-packing industry to many smaller plants in outlying cities and towns has in recent years occasioned the necessity for increases in the number of veterinarians and lay inspectors. In view of the fact that similar inspection service which has for a number of years been provided to plants packing seafood products is now being paid for in full by the packers and since it has long been believed that the cost of meat inspection should be borne by the product through the assessment of fees against the packers measured by the amount and the cost of services received, the committee has included legislation which will require hereafter that the packers of meat products pay fees in amounts requisite to cover the cost of the service rendered and has established and appropriated a revolving fund of $5,000,000, which is a reduction of $6,140,000 under the budget estimate. If the committee's recommendations receive the approval of the Congress, the meat inspection appropriation will disappear from the bill and the annual pressure for increasing this appropriation to meet the increasing needs will no longer be present for the reason that such increasing needs will automatically be cared for through the increased fees collected.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

The budget estimate of $1,136,000 which is an increase of $142,188 above the current appropriation has been reduced in the sum of $125,000 to be applied as follows: To the investigations of the influence of breeding, feeding, and management practices on efficiency of production, $75,000; to the investigations of the nutritional and other physiological factors affecting the usefulness of dairy cattle, $25,000, and to the investigations of milk and milk products, $25,000.

### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

The committee has approved the budget estimate of $2,784,000, an increase of $120,700 above the current amount for investigations of field crops, and has also approved the budget estimate of $2,445,000, an increase above the current amount of $199,700, for investigations of fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops.

*Forest diseases.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $440,000 for forest diseases with the exception of $80,720 allotted for work on diseases of young natural stands and plantings (including white pine blister rust, chestnut blight, and rust of southern pines).

*Agricultural engineering.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $637,000. This includes a decrease of $37,300 by reason of a nonrecurring 1947 item for repair of the physical facilities at field stations and an increase in the same amount of which $30,000 is for increased field labor costs and $7,300 for within-grade salary advancements.

*National Arboretum.*—The budget includes $761,000 for the National Arboretum, which is an increase of $675,100 above the current appropriation. The committee has allowed $350,000 of this increase for the purchase of six tracts of land needed for an entranceway and to round out the natural boundaries of the Arboretum, and $1,000 for within-grade salary promotions. The options for the purchase of these tracts will expire July 31. If not taken up now they cannot be secured

subsequently except at very great advanced cost. The remaining increases relating to the preparation of plans for a development program, the construction of needed roads and the installation of utility systems have been disallowed.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

*Insect investigations.*—The budget estimate for insect investigations is in the sum of $3,150,000, which represents an increase of $200,500 above 1947. The committee has made a total reduction of $188,700 as follows: The budget estimate of $182,100 for insects affecting man and animals has been cut back to $100,000; the estimate of $158,700 for identification and classification of insects has been cut back to $100,000; and the estimate of $222,900 for control investigations has been cut back to $175,000.

*Insect and plant-disease control.*—The budget estimate for insect and plant disease control is $3,467,000, which is an increase of $115,400 above the current appropriation. The action by the committee on this item is as follows: It has eliminated entirely the allotments for Dutch elm disease control with the exception of $51,800 for work to determine action to be taken by cooperating agencies to protect elm trees in areas of general infection. The items eliminated are: Identification of infected trees $27,700; quarantine enforcement $42,400, and surveys to determine the areas where the disease occurs as a basis for quarantine enforcement $119,800, making, in all, a total reduction of $269,900 under the Dutch elm project. The testimony presented to the committee was to the effect that State contributions for this work are falling off, evidencing a diminishing hope for ultimate control of this disease. The item for pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control for which the budget allotment is $999,000, has been reduced in the sum of $500,000. The committee reduction includes complete elimination of work in wild cotton in Florida with discretion left to the Department to apply the remaining portion of the cut among the several projects.

*Foreign plant quarantines.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $2,000,000 for foreign plant quarantines, which represents an increase of $258,000 over 1947. This increase is due primarily to the increasing number of airplane arrivals from foreign points, particularly from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which constitute serious danger areas. The committee believes that it would be proper for the cost of these quarantine inspections to be met from fees collected from the air lines or other carriers bringing passengers or cargo from any foreign point necessitating the quarantine and inspection measures appropriated for under this item. It is expected the Department will give some study to this plan during the coming year with a view of reporting its recommendations with respect thereto in connection with the 1949 budget.

*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.*—The budget has estimated for this item the same amount as was provided for 1947, namely, $2,800,000. This is primarily an emergency item and the total amount needed and the several subamounts for the various potential insect emergencies is largely a matter of speculation. As a result the budget break-down shows a total of $1,382,500 reserved

for allotment. The budget allotments include, for the white fringed beetle control, $848,500; for pear psylla control, $495,000; and for Hall scale eradication, $74,000, the balance of the fund being unallotted. Advices received by the committee indicate the allotment for pear psylla control can be reduced in the sum of $250,000. The committee has made such reduction together with an additional reduction of $500,000 from the unallotted portion, or a total reduction for the item of $750,000, leaving an appropriation of $2,050,000.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

The budget estimate of $5,664,050 for all activities under the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry is in the same amount as for the current fiscal year with the exception of one increase of $80,000 under the regional research laboratories for within-grade salary advancements. The committee was impressed with the excellence of the work performed and the importance of the results attained by the researches carried on under this bureau. It has approved the full amount of the budget estimate for each of the several items.

### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,045,000 for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. This represents an increase of $25,000 for the preparation of materials to promote the prompt dissemination and the application of results of timely scientific investigations in human nutrition and home economics. The committee is impressed with the achievements of this Bureau. Whereas, the total annual expenditures for research under the Department approximate $30,000,000, it is notable that most of the research relates to such items as the breeding and feeding of better hogs and other livestock and breeding and cultural investigations relating to the crops grown in the field, leaving but $1,000,000 for the improvement of the living conditions in the farmer's home where, after all is said and done, it is quite generally agreed, the Nation's greatest crop—that of human beings—is produced. The work of this Bureau seems to be in excellent hands, and it is apparently maintaining effective contacts with the women and women's national organizations devoted to the improvement of the American home. The committee had the benefit of the very excellent and convincing testimony of the representatives of the organizations referred to. It should be stated that many of the results of the research by this Bureau redound to the benefit of homes in the city as well as to those on the farm.

### WHITE PINE BLISTER-RUST CONTROL

The budget estimate of $4,000,000 for white pine blister-rust control represents a decrease of $2,000,000 under the amount appropriated for 1947. The committee has approved the budget decrease and has imposed an additional reduction of $250,000 on the project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. It is the belief of the committee that over the years an adequate knowledge of the techniques in the control

of white pine blister rust have been rather fully developed and that the estimated amount for guidance and leadership is extraordinarily large. For this reason it was reduced.

### FLOOD CONTROL

Appropriations for flood control are made available until expended, the result being that for each year's direct appropriation there usually comes over from the former year certain unexpended balances. Intelligent consideration of the funds provided must therefore be on the basis of total funds available rather than on a total appropriated for the respective years. On that basis the amount for flood control for the fiscal year 1947 was $3,500,000 and the amount available for obligation for 1948 is estimated to be $2,500,619. This represents a reduction under the current year of $999,381. The appropriation required to be made and for which a budget estimate has been submitted is $500,000. This amount has been allowed by the committee and is included in the accompanying bill. The carry-over from 1947 amounts to $2,019,619. Of the total funds available, $11,000 will be transferred to "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture," and $8,000 to the Office of the Solicitor, leaving the $2,500,619 above-mentioned available for obligation during the 1948 program. It was disclosed at the hearings that in former years some of the expenditures have not been applied to the particular projects set up in the break-downs presented in the Department's justification notes. The committee disapproves of the practice of indulging in any such departures and expects that hereafter expenditures of unobligated funds, whether appropriated this year or whether carried over from previous fiscal years, shall be in compliance with the project breakdowns presented to the committee.

### FOREST SERVICE

*General administrative expenses.*—The budget estimate of $682,000 for general administrative expenses of the Forest Service has been reduced to $650,000. The committee has the impression that this activity is overstaffed at the top and that the small cut of $32,000 can be applied without injury to the service in the forests themselves. This cut is predicated in part upon the reductions ordered by the committee throughout the Department in public relations and publicity activities. The committee believes that work of this kind is over emphasized in the Forest Service and can well be reduced.

*National forest protection and management.*—This appropriation is for the care and administration of the national domain of forest lands. The budget estimate of $25,310,000 for costs of administration of these lands has been reduced in the total sum of $1,545,109. The project for general management and operation, to which the budget has allowed $7,082,169, has been reduced in the sum of $500,000. A very large percentage of this allotment is represented by office work, which the committee believes is overemphasized. Relatively, the reduction is not very drastic and should not result in any injury to the forests themselves or their maintenance. The budget allotment of $2,675,276 for the maintenance of improvements other than roads and trails has been cut in the sum of $100,000. The forest-fire-control

allotment of $7,154,877 has not been reduced. The committee was much impressed with the testimony of the Chief of the United States Weather Bureau respecting the use of radar in connection with the location and determination of direction of thunderstorms. Since a large percentage of forest fires originate from lightning during thunderstorms, it is believed that the use of radar equipment can be very helpful in reducing the losses from storm-induced forest fires since the warning of the existence and the path of such storms would enable the Forest Service to make preparatory moves to care for the many fires resulting. The Weather Bureau indicated it is installing radar equipment in general agricultural regions, particularly in the Middle West where tornadoes are of frequent occurrence, as rapidly as such equipment can be obtained from Army surplus or other sources. The Weather Bureau is aware of its possibilities where located in forest areas and has in mind the establishment of radar equipment in such areas at an early date. The budget allotment of $3,915,166 for timber and forest products sales has been reduced by $600,000. This reduction, however, is not designed to interfere with the reforestation program. The allotment of $162,813 for the production of wildlife resources in the forests has been eliminated entirely. It is not the purpose of the committee to eliminate the function relating to wildlife resources. It believes, however, that the function can be cared for out of other general items. There is also the possibility of elimination of what the committee believes may be duplication in this field of work now being carried on by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department and similar services of the States. The committee has not reduced the allotment of $1,966,291 for the reforestation and revegetation of denuded forest areas. It wishes to point out, however, that this work very closely parallels similar work now carried on by the Soil Conservation Service and believes the Department should give it careful attention with a view to preventing or eliminating any duplication which may exist.

*Forest and range management investigations.*—The committee has approved the full amount of the budget allotment of $1,309,461 for experimental forests and ranges. This will provide for the continued operation of the service experimental stations, many of which were established under last year's allotment, which was approximately three times the allotment for this purpose for the fiscal year 1946. The committee has not deemed it wise to further expand this program of establishing experimental forests at this time and has confined itself to providing the necessary amount to continue those stations already in operation. The committee has reduced the budget allotment of $762,731, for forest management, by $200,000. The committee has been impressed with the repeated references over the years to the forests as one of the Nation's most important agricultural crops. Last year and again this year the committee has had tables inserted in the record (see pp. 99–100 of pt. 2 of the hearings) showing the disproportionately small percentage of State experiment stations' funds devoted to research in connection with this important crop. The table cited shows that, whereas forest crops comprise 11.8 percent of the value of all agricultural crops, the State experiment stations have devoted only 0.99 percent of their total expenditures to research in connection with forest crops. The committee believes the obligation of the States to devote their experiment-station funds to research in

forestry is as great as their obligation with respect to research on other farm crops. The existing trend to throw almost the entire burden of research on forest crops upon the Federal Government should, in the opinion of the committee, be halted or at least slowed down and the States should be required to assume a more proportionate share of this responsibility. The committee intends to follow this matter up from year to year and if the State experiment stations show no inclination to meet their responsibilities in this field, the committee will consider what means may exist to require it.

*Forest products.*—The budget estimate of $1,555,000 for forest products research has been reduced to $1,000,000. The work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has never enjoyed the high esteem of the committee or of the Congress. Much of the work pursued at this laboratory is academic or visionary in character and has not, in the opinion of the committee, given practical results consonant with the vast sums which have been applied over the years. The committee believes that the $1,000,000 allowed will be ample for the carrying on of all research which may be worth while.

*Forest resources investigations.*—The budget estimate, of $1,072,000 for forest resources investigations has been reduced by $500,000. Here again, in the opinion of the committee, the work is largely academic and lacks in real practical value. The amount allowed is more than twice that appropriated for the fiscal year 1946 and many years previous thereto. It should be ample to permit the carrying on of all the work which has practical value.

*Forest fire cooperation.*—The committee has approved the full amount of the budget estimate of $9,000,000 for forest fire cooperation. This is in full amount of the authorization. The work done under this appropriation and its value to the forests is, in the opinion of the committee, not excelled by any other activity in the Forest Service.

*Farm and other private forestry cooperation.*—The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $809,500. This is another item which stands high in the esteem of the committee. It is carrying the work direct to the farm and is resulting in additional dollars in the farmers' pocket as well as improvement in the conservation of the soils of the farms.

*Acquisition of lands in national forest.*—The budget of $1,000,000 for acquisition of forest lands has been reduced to $500,000. The bill provides that the money shall be available only for payment for lands purchased. The committee believes that the general administrative funds of the Forest Service are available, and will be ample, to cover the salaries and expenses incidental to the relatively small purchase program provided by the bill.

## FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The appropriation for Forest Roads and Trails is divided into two parts, namely (1) forest highways, or public highways through the national forests and (2) forest-development roads, which are for access roads leading into the forests. The budget estimate for forest highways is in the sum of $11,300,000, which the committee has reduced to $5,300,000, which is a reduction under the budget of $6,000,000. The Federal Highway Act of 1944 authorizes $25,000,000 for forest

highways for each of the first three postwar fiscal years. There has already been appropriated $4,500,000 of the authorization for the first postwar fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1946. The budget estimate of $11,300,000 will still be substantially below the total amount authorized for the fiscal year which ended 2 years previous to the end of the fiscal year for which appropriations are being made in this bill. Apparently the needs and the availability of material and labor precluded the possibility of living up to the statutory authorization. The committee believes that in this period of high cost of construction a very limited program should be undertaken and it has therefore made the cut above indicated. A similar philosphy would, of course, apply to forest-development roads. However, in view of the need for these roads to open up additional timber supplies which will be in great demand if and when the building revival gets under way, the committee has reduced the budget estimate of $12,500,000 to $10,000,000. The committee feels assured that the sums provided under the general head of forest roads and trails will be all that can be prudently expended in the next fiscal year.

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

*Research.*—The budget estimate for soil-conservation research is in the sum of $1,423,000, bring in the same amount as for 1947. This research has been going on for a period of almost 20 years under which contour planting and cultivation, terracing, and various other soil-conserving and erosion-preventing devices have been worked out. The committee believes that a great many of the problems attacked by this service in the beginning have been solved; the farmers have been instructed in putting them into practice, and a substantial reduction in the amount of the appropriation can be effected without harm to the cause of soil conservation. It has therefore imposed a cut of $750,000 under the budget estimate leaving for this purpose a total of $673,000.

*Soil conservation operations.*—The budget estimate of $43,437,000, for soil conservation operations is double the amount appropriated for the same purpose 10 years ago. Here again the committee believes that some reduction can be effected without damage to the cause of conservation of the soil and has imposed a cut of $5,437,000, with the restriction that no part of the cut shall be applied to the project for the operation of conservation nurseries. This appropriation is expended primarily in the form of technical advice and assistance rendered to the various State soil conservation districts. As the number of such districts have increased year by year with the accompanying requests for technical advice, this appropriation has experienced a parallel growth. The committee believes that many of the soil conservation districts which have been in existence a number of years will be able to get along with materially reduced technical assistance and advice. The advice and assistance given in the initial years of these districts ought not to require repetition year after year, certainly not to the degree such advice was needed in the beginning. The committee believes that the cut imposed can be so distributed by the Department that no harm will come to the work in any of the districts.

The report already points out in connection with the item for Extension Service that the large field forces for extension service, the

Soil Conservation Service and the Farmers Home Administration, all of whom are engaged in related activities, might well be consolidated in the interest of economy. This is a matter which should have immediate attention by the legislative committee on agriculture because the suggested consolidation would be fruitful of greater efficiency and economy.

### CONSERVATION AND USE PAYMENTS

For the fiscal year 1948 there was before the committee a request for $301,720,000 with which to carry on the so-called agricultural adjustment program, better-styled conservation and use payments under the administration of the Production and Marketing Administration. For the fiscal year 1947 there was available for this purpose $314,246,000. For 1948 the request calls for a direct appropriation of $201,720,000 and the transfer of $100,000,000 from section 32 funds, making a total of $301,720,000.

Of this amount roughly $267,000,000 is disbursed to farmers in the form of cash payments and advances for soil-conservation materials and the balance, aggregating about $34,000,000, is devoted to administrative expenses at national, State, and local levels.

The field expense at the county level for administering this program totals about $24,500,000 and embraces the per diem services of 9,087 county committeemen and 97,663 community committeemen.

For National and State administrative purposes the cost is estimated at $9,095,868 and involves the services of 481 persons at the departmental level, and 2,630 at the State level.

After full consideration of the matter the committee determined that funds for payment to farmers for soil conservation practices should be reduced by $117,620,754, leaving a balance for this purpose of $150,000,000 as distinguished from the $267,620,754 requested. In addition the committee provided that administrative expenses at the National and State level should be reduced from $9,095,868 to $1,950,000 and that expenditures at the county and community level should be reduced to the sum of $13,050,000. The foregoing reduction of administrative cost is made possible under the following provision which has been inserted in the bill:

*Provided further,* That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80).

The above provision eliminates entirely all the work heretofore performed by members of the county committees or their staffs in checking the accuracy or the veracity of the statements by farmers of their performance of the prescribed conservation practices and of their compliance with all other requirements upon which payments are conditioned. The committee believes the certificate of the farmer under the formalities prescribed will be as dependable as the income taxpayer's certificate of the correctness of his return made under precisely similar penalties.

The reduced allocation for administrative expenses at the State and National level should be entirely adequate in view of the fact that the bill prohibits any expenditure in the formulation of a 1948 program.

Full power has been given to the Secretary to prescribe the form of the certificate to be signed by the farmer claiming payment. It is anticipated that the form prescribed will require the claimant to specify the several prescribed practices and conditions with which he has complied—as he is now required to do—and that it will carry suitable reference to the statute under the provisions of which his certificate is required to be made. The county committee and its staff will, of course, render the farmer such assistance as he may require in filling out his application for payment.

In addition, a proviso is recommended so that where unexpended funds are available from one area or region, these may within the discretion of the Production and Marketing Administration, be made generally applicable to other areas and regions.

In addition, the committee has stricken from the bill the language which would authorize a $200,000,000 program for the crop year 1948 for this general purpose.

A number of considerations entered into the determination of the committee that the amounts requested for this purpose be substantially reduced. In the first place, it should be pointed out as indicated in the Secretary's statement that farm assets of all kinds exceed by far all such assets for any time in the history of American agriculture.

In the second place, the committee points out that the President has recognized this fact and has suggested in his budget message that for the crop year 1948 these payments could be reduced on the ground that many farmers are in a position to carry on soil-conservation work without a bonus from the Federal Treasury. As a matter of fact, the crop year 1947 would be even better comparatively speaking than the crop year 1948 and there is, therefore, no good reason why the reduction should not be undertaken for the present crop year.

It has been repeatedly affirmed that the Federal Government has made commitments to agricultural producers for the crop year 1947 and is, therefore, obligated to appropriate the requested $301,720,000, but with this view the committee does not agree. In prior years the committee made it plain to departmental officials that the program was contingent upon appropriations made by the Congress and repeatedly insisted that this fact be made clear to agricultural producers. The Department testified that millions of circulars relating to the farm program for 1947 were printed and distributed to all cooperating farmers so that it is abundantly clear to all participants that the program is based upon whatever funds are made available for this purpose.

Well-considered expressions of opinion were placed before the committee to the effect that soil-conservation payments should be deleted entirely from the bill, but the committee believe that it should be tapered off beginning in the present crop year and completely eliminated for the crop year 1948 because the question of a long-range agricultural program is a matter which must be reexamined and redetermined by the Legislative Committee on Agriculture and by the Congress.

Perhaps, one other thing should be mentioned and that is that about 60 percent of all payments distributed under this program are paid to 20 percent of the Nation's farmers. For the crop years 1945 and 1946 more than 63 percent of all participating farmers received less than $60 each, which amounts to but 22 percent of the total payments, whereas 20 percent of all farmers received in excess of $100, amounting to 60 percent of the total payments. This would seem sufficiently persuasive of the need for a complete reevaluation of this program in the light of future needs.

In its deliberations the committee considered the advisability of incorporating in the language of the bill a formula for the distribution of payments under which such payments would be graduated on the basis of ability to conserve. This would provide a larger percentage of the payments in the case of those who would normally receive the smallest payment or advance and then be progressively reduced in the case of those who by virtue of their financial ability and the stability of their farming operations could better afford to undertake this work. This approach, however, was discarded, and the matter of distribution of payments was left in the hands of those who administer the program.

### SECTION 32 FUNDS

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, makes a permanent appropriation of a sum of money equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts of the calendar year last previous to the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. Thirty percent of the customs receipts for the calendar year 1946 amounts to approximately $148,000,000. The purpose of the appropriation is (1) to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and their products, (2) to encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce, and (3) to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. This act was passed during the period of farm surpluses and low prices for farm commodities, with the view to steadying the market for such commodities through the disposition of the surpluses. But now, in a period of short production rather than over production and of unusually high prices for farm products, there is no need for this appropriation in the fiscal year 1948. The Budget Bureau proposes the use of $100,000,000 of the section 32 funds for 1948 for the payment of benefits to farmers under the agricultural conservation program. The committee has not followed the Budget recommendation respecting the use of this fund in connection with the farm program. It has made a direct appropriation from the Treasury of the full amount recommended in the bill for the farm program and has rescinded the entire amount of the permanent appropriation under section 32 for 1948. The committee wishes to emphasize that its action in rescinding all section 32 funds for the fiscal year 1948 should not be taken to mean that similar action should be taken in future years. This fund is intended to provide relief in emergent periods when a surplus problem exists. It is always possible that such a condition may develop in other years and that the fund

may be genuinely necessary to meet this problem. That problem, however, does not exist at the present time and the committee entertains the conviction that for the fiscal year 1948 these funds can be safely rescinded.

### SUGAR ACT

The budget has estimated $55,000,000 for the administration of the provisions of the Sugar Act. This sum is an increase of $1,500,000 above the amount for 1947. The amount allotted for payments to sugar producers under the budget is $53,623,885, the balance being allotted for administrative expenses with the exception of $4,000 which is transferred to the International Production Control Committee and $21,750 transferred to the General Accounting Office. The amount required for payments to sugar producers is somewhat in excess of $55,000,000, but since the latter amount is the maximum authorized to be appropriated, the committee has approved that amount for inclusion in the bill. However, the committee has decided to reduce the national office administrative expense item by $50,000, which will make that amount additional for payments to sugar producers. It might be of interest to note that the sugar program is not only self-sustaining but in fact returns a profit of $15,000,000 or more per year to the Federal Treasury.

### THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

For the fiscal year 1948 the budget requested a direct annual appropriation of $75,000,000 for the school-lunch program under authority of Public Law 396 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was approved June 4, 1946. Under the provisions of this act appropriations by the Federal Government for the school-lunch program shall be matched by the States on a 1-to-1 basis until 1950, a 1½-to-1 basis from 1950 to 1955 and a 3-to-1 basis after 1955. The act also provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may determine what funds derived from sources within the State may be included for matching purposes.

For fiscal year 1947 the sum of $81,000,000 was made available for the program, of which $75,000,000 was secured by transfer from what are commonly known as section 32 funds under the act of 1935, which provides that 30 percent of customs receipts may be set aside for various purposes, such as diversion to new uses, exports, etc., to meet the surplus problems of agriculture.

The committee desires to make plain certain considerations in connection with this program and as a justification for its reduction of the estimates from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000.

Contrary to the generally expressed belief that this is a program of free lunches for school children, the testimony is plain and explicit that only one child out of every nine receives a free meal. Eight out of every nine school children who participate in the program pay the full amount of the school lunch, which would be the cost of lunch minus the Federal subsidy.

Secondly, it should be pointed out that this is no longer a surplus program for here again the testimony is abundantly clear that schools can purchase whatever foods they desire without regard to whether such foods are in surplus supply or not. It has become a nutrition program.

At an early date, it should be pointed out that this is a direct cash subsidy from the Federal Government. An examination of the testimony will disclose that schools operate their own programs, make their own purchases, and render accounts to the State educational authority at the end of each month and are then reimbursed in cash from the funds allotted to the State by the Federal Government and from funds derived within the State.

It appears that in the year 1946 about $234,000,000 was expended on this program in 55,000 schools. This amount was derived from the following sources: the Federal Government provided $75,000,000, States and local subdivisions by direct appropriation provided only $11,500,000, gifts and donations of money, commodities, and services accounted for another $25,000,000, sales of school lunches provided $123,000,000. An interpretation by the Secretary of Agriculture of the provisions of Public Law 396 enables the States to include not only direct appropriations but donations and gifts of all kinds and also the money derived from the sale of lunches to the children for the purposes of this program. The committee believes that while the Secretary of Agriculture does possess such authority under the permissive provisions of the School Lunch Act, it was never the purpose of Congress that funds derived from the children should be included for matching purposes notwithstanding the fact that there was an allusion to this matter in the report which accompanied the School Lunch Act when it was considered by the Congress. The committee believes that the States should by direct appropriations match the money provided by the Federal Government and if such were the case the appropriation herein would be reduced to $11,500,000. The committee believes that it has been more than generous in including for matching purposes funds derived from gifts, donations, and services which total about $25,000,000 and has added thereto an item of $10,000,000 under the provisions of the act relating to nonfood assistance for the acquisition of equipment and facilities. This would total about $45,000,000. In addition thereto, the committee has included a proviso which definitely excludes funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes and also points out herein that it might be advisable to require school authorities to certify their need for Federal funds before they become eligible for Federal assistance.

There is a considerable body of opinion to the effect that the Federal Government should step out of the school-lunch program entirely on the ground that this is essentially and primarily a State function and that the States can well afford to carry on this program from their own resources. It is all important that the responsibility for the financing of this program should be shifted back to the States as rapidly as possible, else many of the measures now being undertaken to bring the Federal Government more firmly within the realm of solvency will be aborted. It should be borne in mind that the cost of feeding destitute children in foreign countries falls very largely upon the United States, an obligation which rests 100 percent upon the Federal Treasury. It does not seem too much to suggest that the cost of school lunches for the children of America, most of whom are able to pay for them, might well be borne by the States.

A recent compilation of surpluses accumulated by the various States indicates that the State of California is presently carrying a comfortable State balance of $430,000,000, Iowa, $29,000,000, Illinois, $158,-

000,000; Mississippi, $40,000,000; Pennsylvania, $234,000,000; North Carolina, $153,000,000. Compare these comfortable balances with the condition of the Federal Government which is wrestling with a staggering load of debt presently estimated to be $258,000,000,000. It should also be pointed out that this program presently reaches about one-fourth of the eligible schools throughout the Nation and that an extension of the program to all such schools will in time cost the Federal Government an estimated $600,000,000 or more annually. The committee is not unmindful of the widespread interest in the school-lunch program but the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government demands that it be kept within due bounds and that the States be required to provide their just share of the program.

### MARKETING SERVICES

The appropriations for marketing services fall under a number of heads. These items cover such activities as the market news service, market inspection of farm products, marketing farm products, tobacco acts, freight rates for farm products, and the enforcement of a number of regulatory acts. The total of the budget estimate for these several services is in the sum of $9,843,000, which is a reduction below 1947 of $535,072. This reduction is the net effect of relatively small increases in most of the items and a decrease of $1,111,500 under marketing farm products due to the elimination of various regulations and controls, wage stabilization, food, industry and labor programs and other activities necessary for the period immediately following the war. The committee has approved all budget estimates under this head, except as noted below. Under marketing farm products, the committee has imposed a fund cut of $400,000, leaving an appropriation of $1,000,000. The committee believes that the work under this appropriation very closely parallels, if it does not duplicate, the studies provided for in the appropriation for the research and marketing act field. In view of the amount provided under that head, the committee believes the cut of $400,000 can be effected without injury. Under the United States Warehouse Act where the budget is for $685,000, the committee has imposed a cut of $100,000.

### COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The budget estimate for administration of the Commodity Exchange Act is in the sum of $650,000, which represents an increase of $129,000, above the 1947 appropriation. The committee has allowed $9,000 of the increase to cover the cost of within-grade salary advancements and has disallowed the remainder. This will give the agency the full amount of their 1947 appropriation together with all Pay Act increases and within-grade promotions, which the committee believes will provide as good enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act for the next year as has been had during the current year.

### THE FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Public Law No. 731 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, known as the Farmers' Home Administration Act abolished the rehabilitation programs of the old Farm Security Administration and the emergency

crop and feed loan program administered by the FCA and placed these activities together with other functions under the Farmers' Home Administration. It is therefore in a sense the descendant of the Farm Security Administration.

Its over-all program now includes: (1) Making and serving farm tenant purchase loans; (2) making, serving, and collecting production and subsistence loans; (3) rural rehabilitation aid; (4) developing with loans and technical guidance the expansion of water facilities in arid and semiarid areas; and (5) the establishment and development of a system of farm tenant mortgage insurance.

The committee has made substantial reductions in virtually every item of the FHA, but it should be noted that these reductions are not intended to convey the impression that the committee is dissatisfied with the administrative direction of Mr. Lassiter. In fact, the committee feels that Mr. Lassiter has been a forthright and capable administrator and predicates its reductions on other grounds.

*Farm tenant loans.*—For the fiscal year 1947, $40,000,000 was available for this purpose. For 1948 the budget has submitted an estimate of $35,000,000. The committee has deleted the entire amount and the bill carries nothing for this project. The committee always has been, and remains today, a firm friend of the farm-tenant-loan program which is designed to reduce the amount of farm tenancy and to increase the number of farm owners. The committee believes, however, that the present inflation in farm-land values threatens to abort the efforts of the Congress to eliminate farm tenancy. The present inflated values are, in time, certain to collapse and farmers who have been saddled with loans at the current inflated values will surely come to grief. The committee does not wish to contribute to this unfortunate result by making any appropriation at the present time for loans under this program. It believes that to do so would be to contribute to the current inflationary trend. The committee's action in eliminating this appropriation should strengthen the hand of the President in his current move to halt the excessive inflation of farm-land values which has been under way for some time, and which seems, at the moment, to be gathering speed.

*Production and subsistence loans.*—The estimate of $90,000,000 for this purpose was reduced by $30,000,000. Bank credit is available in abundance, funds are plentiful where justified and $60,000,000 should be sufficient for this program.

*Farm tenant mortgage insurance fund.*—This program is designed to do for farm tenant mortgage loans what the Federal Housing Administration does for urban mortgage loans. It is hoped by the authors of the program that in due time, this system will completely replace the making of Federal loans to tenants for the purchase of farms.

The program however presents a difficulty. The limit of interest on a mortgage that can be insured is 2½ percent and the Administrator candidly stated that as yet, he has no applications for insurance of a farm mortgage loan. It is doubtful whether this program can have any effect until the basic law is modified.

However, the committee is not averse to the creation of the fund, one-half of 1 percent of which can be devoted to expenses and one-half of 1 percent for the building of a reserve fund. An estimated $15,000,000 for this purpose for 1948 is wholly unnecessary, and it has accordingly been reduced to $1,000,000.

*Water facilities.*—The committee approved the budget estimate of $1,750,000 for this purpose. The program has been well administered; it has been kept within reasonable limits, repayments from individuals and associations have been good, and the benefits have been substantial.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The estimate of $30,000,000 for this purpose has been reduced to $18,000,000 for 1948. This is the fund from which salaries and expenses are paid for the rehabilitation and assistance program to farm tenants and here again, the committee wishes to emphasize its conviction that much of this work at the county and farm level is a duplication of work carried on by the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service.

Under this activity, the Farmers' Home Administration maintains 439 persons in Washington, 950 persons in 40 State offices, 236 in 150 district offices, 871 in 4 area finance offices, and 5,624 in the county offices. Compare this with Extension Service which has more than 10,000 persons, most of whom are at the county level, and with Soil Conservation Service which maintains offices at the departmental, regional, State, district, and work-unit levels, totaling about 12,000 persons.

Here again, the committee wishes to point out the limitations within the appropriation procedure and suggests immediate action by the legislative committee to consolidate these functions in the interest of efficiency and economy.

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The budget estimate of $5,600,000 for salaries and expenses has been reduced to $4,000,000. This amount exceeds any amount that has been appropriated for this purpose for previous years up to and including 1945. As late as the fiscal year 1938, the appropriation was only $1,450,000. The growth of this appropriation is due very largely to the fact that it is apparently the policy and the purpose of the Rural Electrification Administration to continue its paternal oversight and supervision of each cooperative until the last penny of the cooperative debt has been liquidated. From the inception of the program, those in charge have every year boasted of the financial soundness of the cooperatives. They have reported the large number which have made payments on their loans much in advance of the amounts due at the time.

"Spoon feeding" ad infinitum: In spite of the fact that these cooperatives have had the benefit of the initial advice and supervision on the part of the administration, insistence is made that this same supervision be indefinitely continued. The committee believes that when a cooperative has been "taught to walk," so to speak, and has acquired a substantial equity in the capital investment of the cooperative, that it is in line with sound policy and with the philosophy of individual responsibility upon which this Republic has been erected that they should be permitted thenceforth to "walk alone." Perhaps here and there they may make mistakes but they will be able to absorb the cost of those mistakes out of their equities; and they will have learned their lesson. The committee believes the probability of mistakes on the part of farmer managements of the various cooperatives are no greater than those of the Administrator and his assistants in the office

here in Washington operating from long range. This opinion is predicated upon the observations the committee has been able to make of the abilities and qualifications of the managers and members of the boards of the electric cooperatives who have appeared before the committee or whom the members have had the opportunity to observe in the field.

Consequently, the amount of $4,000,000 allowed in the bill, if applied to the supervision of the activities of the more recently organized cooperatives, leaving those organized earlier which have acquired experience and have made substantial payments on their loans to "paddle their own canoe," will, in the opinion of the committee be sufficient to give adequate protection to the investments of the Government and to the newer and less experienced cooperative enterprises.

*Loans.*—The budget estimate of $225,000,000 for Rural Electrification Administration loans to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been allowed, but a provision is inserted authorizing and directing that henceforth such sums shall be borrowed directly from the Secretary of the Treasury, rather than from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and eliminating the existing provision of law that such loans may be made only in the amount of 85 percent of the appraised value of the projects to be constructed from such loans. The budget estimate requested a direct appropriation of $25,000,000 from the Treasury to cover the 15 percent margin resulting from the existing provisions of the law, but, that requirement having been eliminated by the provision carried in the bill, the committee recommends no direct appropriation.

Under the present law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation borrows money from the Secretary of the Treasury at 1 percent interest. It then lends the money to the Rural Electrification Administrator at 1¾ percent interest who, in turn, lends it to the coops at 2 percent. The evidence indicates that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation incurs no administrative expense for determining the soundness of the loans but merely makes such loans as the performance of a ministerial act. Thus, the differential of three-fourths of 1 percent in the interest rate paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury and that which it collects from the Rural Electrification Administrator, represents a clean profit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of three-fourths of 1 percent. Under the provision included in the bill, all the interest paid by the co-ops on all previous outstanding loans as well as future loans will go immediately to the Treasury, without the present stop-over on the part of three-fourths of 1 percent in the coffers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there to be commingled with the deficit or the surplus, as the case may be, of the Corporation's over-all capital fund. On the basis of the present total outstanding REA loans, the flow of payments from the co-ops to the Treasury will be increased by approximately $4,280,000 per annum.

The committee was importuned to authorize loan funds far in excess of those submitted by the budget. It believes that the amount carried in the bill will be more than ample to care for all construction that can possibly be made under the existing restrictions resulting from scarcity of materials and equipment of every kind essential to the

setting up and placing in full operation of the farmer electric cooperatives.

A condition is arising in the rural electrification field which merits the attention of Congress, and particularly the legislative committee which has jurisdiction over REA matters. It relates to the construction of generating facilities in those areas where an adequate power supply now exists. If REA undertakes to duplicate such facilities, it is likely to develop a condition under which the cooperatives which obligate themselves for such facilities, as well as the private utilities operating in the same field, may experience difficulty in operating on a pay-in basis, and no good purpose could be served by such a condition.

The committee discussed the advisability of a proposal to confer upon the Federal Power Commission or upon the State commissions or authorities having jurisdiction of such matter, the power to veto a loan for the acquisition, construction, operation, enlargement, or extension of a generating plant unless there was a finding that such acquisition, construction, operation, enlargement, or extension would result in lower cost of electrical energy to a rural electrification project or that the supply of power from existing generating facilities was inadequate for all rural electrification needs.

The committee wishes to point out that if a duplication of unnecessary facilities should develop it will affect the real payment capacity of cooperatives as well as the return to existing utilities on capital investment and might ultimately produce the same condition which developed in the transportation industry resulting in tremendous losses to innocent holders of securities.

At the present time there is no existing limitation upon REA in this respect and it is believed that an appropriate agency either in the Federal or State government should have some supervisory authority in this matter.

## CROP INSURANCE

In February 1938 Congress approved the creation of a Crop Insurance Corporation to make available insurance against all natural hazards on wheat. In 1941 this program was expanded to include cotton. The program operated for a number of years with very substantial losses and its liquidation was provided for by a provision carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944. That provision was subsequently modified and the program was reinstated as of December 23, 1944, and made applicable to wheat, cotton, and flax on a national basis and to certain other commodities on a trial basis.

The Crop Insurance Corporation was originally capitalized at $100,000,000 and received its operating funds by issuing portions of its capital stock from time to time to the Federal Treasury. Provision is carried in this bill for an additional subscription to the capital stock in the sum of $10,000,000 and this will exhaust the Corporation's borrowing power. That is to say, losses have finally exhausted the $100,000,000 which was made available for this experiment in crop insurance. It is the considered opinion of the subcommittee that the program should be placed entirely upon an experimental basis and that the Corporation's request for administrative funds for the fiscal year in the sum of $9,330,000 be reduced to $1,000,000 and that what-

ever funds are not required for this purpose shall be returned to the Treasury. It is appropriate to note that the Committee on Agriculture has reported a bill (H. R. 3465) to place this activity on a completely experimental basis. This action is in line with the views entertained by the committee and provides further justification for the sharp reduction in administrative expenses which has been recommended in this bill.

Included in the hearings is a detailed statement by the Secretary of Agriculture appraising the operations of this program which sets forth some dismal experiences with high administrative costs, small premium totals, and high losses in various States. While the original program has been modified to place it on a sounder actuarial basis, losses are still excessive and if administrative expenditures are included for the purpose of securing a complete picture of the outlay which has been made from Federal funds for the crop-insurance program it becomes impressive of the fact that unless a sound and actuarial approach is developed through experimentation the entire program should be completely liquidated.

Consider wheat as an example. Since the beginning of the program in 1939, the Corporation has been able to achieve the insurance of less than 15 percent of the wheat acreage in the country and the interesting fact about wheat insurance is that it appears to have least appeal to the farmers in the plains areas of the country where it would appear to be most essential.

In respect of cotton the Corporation freely recognized the moral hazard involved and the heavy losses which it sustained on the cotton program during the last crop year. The aggregate of premiums from insurance on cotton was roughly $33,000,000, whereas losses totaled nearly $76,500,000 and in some States the loss ratio between premiums collected and losses paid ran as high as 8 to 1.

In five States it would appear that administrative expenses actually exceeded by far the premiums which were collected.

The committee was not unmindful of the fact that a small profit was returned on the insurance program with respect to flax and tobacco, but it must point out that for a crop-insurance program, administered by the Federal Government at high administrative costs, to succeed the program must be placed on a national basis and must be actuarially sound. It is recognized, of course, that this was the goal to be sought when Federal crop insurance was first authorized but the sad fact remains that this experiment has cost the Federal Government $100,000,000 or more to date and it contains no assurance that sounder and better methods have been perfected which will avert extraordinary losses in the future.

In the judgment of many the program should be liquidated entirely. The committee, however, by reducing administrative expenditures from 9⅓ million dollars to 1 million dollars wishes to indicate its conviction that at the very best the program should not go beyond the experimental stage and should be completely skeletonized.

## COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A word about the functions and operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation might be of value as general information to the Congress.

The Corporation operates through a board of directors of which the Secretary of Agriculture is the chairman and operates through the facilities of the Production and Marketing Administration. Its primary purpose is to support agricultural prices in order to preserve farm purchasing power and incentives for production.

Farm prices are supported in a number of ways:

1. By making loans to farmers on their commodities.

2. By purchasing commodities which are in surplus and diverting them into channels where the pressure on the normal commercial market will not be so great.

3. By purchasing commodities for foreign distribution.

Funds for this operation are obtained from the Treasury Department under the borrowing power of the Corporation. The mechanics of this process are simple.

The Corporation issues its note to the Treasury and funds are then advanced. There is a requirement in the act of 1938 under which the Corporation's assets must at no time be less than its liabilities. This relationship is normally maintained by the fact that the Corporation has a capital stock of $100,000,000 so that as it makes loans or purchases and thereby secures assets in the form of commodities or bankable notes, it can comply with the 1938 act.

This fact is of more than academic importance because the committee examined into an item of $500,000,000 in cash which is available to the Corporation by act of Congress for virtually the same purposes as the general credit which the CCC enjoys.

The committee explored the necessity for maintaining this cash balance and was advised that while it has not been touched since 1941, an impairment of the balance between assets and liabilities of the CCC through loans and purchases might make it necessary to use a portion of this fund to maintain that balance as required by law. There is real doubt that the legal requirement for this balance is necessary and if the law were amended, it would be possible to rescind these funds and restore them to the Treasury. The Corporation actually enjoys a credit account of 4¾ billion dollars which should be more than adequate for every foreseeable purpose.

The Corporation's activities might be listed under three general classifications.

1. Price supports for basic commodities. The AAA Act of 1935 as amended requires that prices on the six basic commodities of corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts be supported at 90 percent of the parity price and this is accomplished by loans to producers since these commodities are storable.

2. Price-support program on Steagall commodities. The so-called Steagall amendment to the act of 1941 requires that prices on certain commodities (about 20 in number) be supported for a period of 2 years after the January following the termination of hostilities as proclaimed by the President. Since that proclamation was issued in December of 1946, existing law requires that prices on these commodities be supported until December 31, 1948. The list of so-called Steagall commodities includes beans, chickens, long-staple cotton, eggs, flaxseed hogs, milk and butterfat, dry peas, sweetpotatoes, white potatoes, soybeans, and turkeys.

The Corporation as of this time can only estimate what market conditions may be like and what action may be necessary by ways of purchases to keep prices at required levels.

3. Price supports on other commodities. The Corporation is also authorized to support prices on a third group of commodities which include barley, flax fiber, hemp fiber, naval stores, oats, rye, hay and pasture seeds, winter cover crop seeds, grain sorghums, and wool.

4. A fourth program is called the general supply purchases program which is devoted mainly to the acquisition of commodities to cover foreign requirements and relief commitments.

5. The only subsidy program which will be operative in the present year and in the next fiscal year relates to sugar and embraces all operations relating to the purchase of sugar supplies from foreign sources.

6. Other programs include a foreign purchase program and a commodity export program.

It is estimated that administrative expenses for this entire program for fiscal 1948 will be $11,516,109 which is a reduction of $3,237,524. Slightly more than $3,000,000 of this amount will be received by transfer from UNRRA, foreign governments and other sources for services rendered so that the administrative expenditure from Corporation funds will be $8,450,000.

The committee has not reduced this estimated amount.

There is a growing belief that farm prices will decline in the months ahead and that the work of the Corporation might be as large a volume as in the prior fiscal year. This, of course, is conjectural but it was the feeling of the committee that since price supports are mandated by existing law, the Corporations must be provided with adequate personnel and funds to carry out this statutory directive.

## LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 23 of the bill, in connection with the item for meat inspection:

*Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products; $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal-year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat-inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimate l cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, an l authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect*

*the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: Provided further, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: Provided further, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the Budget as submitted to Congress annually: And provided further, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.*

On page 58, under the Farmers Home Administration:

*All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provisions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or advances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public debt transaction of the United States.*

On page 61, in connection with the Rural Electrification Administration:

*Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947, shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the foregoing provision: Provided, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such trust instru-*

*ments as shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a), any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public debt transaction of the United States.*

*"SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the payment of such loans all moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."*

## COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—2A

The following is submitted in compliance with clause 2a of rule XIII:

| EXISTING LAW | IN PENDING BILL |
|---|---|
| The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, with interest at a rate of 1¾ per centum per annum upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to a rate of 1¾ per centum per | On page 61, beginning with line 9:<br>*Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:*<br>*"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the* |

annum: *Provided*, That no such loan shall be in an amount exceeding 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *And provided further*, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of all such obligations. The amount of the notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

*Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947, shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the foregoing provision: Provided, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make*

*no further loans or advances to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a), any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public debt transaction of the United States.*

*"SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the payment of such loans all moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."*

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*

[NOTE.—The increases and decreases shown are based on comparison with the 1947 estimated available figures]

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| To replace the official automobile of the Secretary (nonrecurring). | +$3,000 | Approved. |
| To establish employee health program pursuant to Public Law 658, 79th Cong. | +45,000 | Do. |
| To strengthen the employee safety program | +10,000 | General reduction of $100,000 imposed against the direct appropriation. |
| To replace worn-out office equipment (nonrecurring) | +7,500 | |
| To maintain adequate central departmental telephone, telegraph, and records services. | +26,000 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +26,850 | Approved. |
| PENALTY MAIL (SEC. 2, PUBLIC LAW 364, 78TH CONG.) | | |
| To cover, in part, increase in mailing rate from $15 to $18.60 per thousand pieces. | +500,000 | Disallowed |
| RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946 | | |
| For payments to States for research at State experiment stations. | +5,000,000 | $3,000,000 allowed. |
| For research on utilization and associated problems in connection with the development and application of present, new, and extended uses of agricultural commodities and products thereof. | +6,000,000 | $1,000,000 allowed. |
| For broadening and strengthening agricultural research, other than utilization research. | +3,000,000 | Do. |
| For research and service work on the marketing of agricultural products. | +5,000,000 | Do. |
| OFFICE OF SOLICITOR | | |
| Salaries and expenses: For within-grade salary advancements. | +46,000 | General reduction of $100,000 imposed against the direct appropriation. |
| OFFICE OF INFORMATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| Decrease in transfers | [−9,735] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+38,950] | General reduction of $125,000. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+29,215] | |
| Increase in direct appropriation: | | |
| To provide a staff adequate to handle the accounting, auditing, and related fiscal responsibilities. | +8,000 | |
| For additional work in answering public and Congressional requests for agricultural information, and for editorial and other work on publications. | +20,000 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,950 | |
| Printing and binding: | | |
| Decrease in transfers | [−15,000] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+296,400] | Do. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+281,400] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation: | | |
| For increased printing costs of program forms, schedules, Farmers' Bulletin lists and periodicals, and Agriculture Yearbook. | +228,200 | Do. |
| For printing technical publications on results of Department research. | +28,200 | Do. |
| For printing new Farmers' Bulletins, reprints and forest map folders. | +40,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| LIBRARY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation." | [−$850] | Approved. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+42,000] | Do. |
| Net increase in funds available | [+41,150] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation: For exchange of publications with libraries in foreign countries, +$20,000; indexing foreign literature issued during the war years, +$10,000; funds by direct appropriation in lieu of annual transfers from Commodity Credit Corporation administrative funds—an offsetting decrease being shown in the CCC budget, +$850; and for within-grade salary advancements, +$11,150. | +42,000 | Do. |
| BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS | | |
| Economic investigations: | | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation." | [−80,150] | Do. |
| Increase in direct appropriation, as detailed below | [+80,143] | General reduction of $750,000 in direct appropriation. |
| Net decrease in funds available | [−7] | |
| Increase in direct appropriation: Increase of $80,150 in direct appropriation in lieu of transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation (shown as offsetting decrease in CCC budget) and a decrease of $7 to round off the appropriation total. | +80,143 | |
| Crop and livestock estimates: | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation to round off appropriation total. | −$50 | Approved. |
| OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS | | |
| Salaries and expenses | | $100,000 reduction imposed. |
| EXTENSION SERVICE | | |
| Payments to States: | | |
| To extend benefits of sec. 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, as authorized by the act of Aug. 28, 1937, in order to help meet urgent health, nutrition, production, and related problems. | +134,000 | Approved. |
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION | | |
| OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For work at the Agricultural Research Center on repair of sewage system, expansion and improvement of coal yard facilities, repair and improvement of roads, installation of a small bituminous materials mixing plant, and maintenance and operation of water treatment plant ($54,200 is nonrecurring). | +75,000 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out farm and other equipment (nonrecurring). | +35,000 | Do. |
| For employment of safety engineer-fire control officer | +4,400 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,400 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring construction items provided in 1947 act. | −141,800 | Do. |
| Elimination of special item in 1947 act for exploratory investigations of agricultural problems in Alaska. | −20,000 | Do. |
| SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND | | $100,000 reduction imposed against "Special research projects." |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS | | |
| To develop domestic sources of natural rubber from guayule and other rubber-bearing plants. | +$170,000 | Approved. |
| For investigations of improved methods for extracting and processing rubber from guayule and other rubber-bearing plants. | +179,000 | Do. |
| RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA | | A total of $144,940 allowed, $100,000 being an increase by the committee above budget and $44,940 transferred from the budget item for payments to Alaska for an agricultural experiment station. |
| OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS | | |
| Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico | | $2,440 of the Budget estimate for Bankhead-Jones Act payments and $42,500 for special Alaska acts, total $44,940, transferred to direct supervision of Secretary of Agriculture under the preceding item for research on agricultural problems of Alaska. |
| Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: | | |
| To overcome a backlog in important publications work. | +14,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +3,000 | Do. |
| Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico: | | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring construction items provided in the 1947 act. | −62,500 | Do. |
| BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY | | |
| Animal husbandry: | | |
| For additional personnel to properly care for experimental animals. | +25,000 | Do. |
| For increased participation in National Poultry Improvement program. | +50,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring items provided in 1947 act for construction of buildings at Glendale, Ariz., poultry station. | −20,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of funds provided in 1947 act for studies of needs for poultry research programs in the Southern Great Plains and Southeastern States. | −7,500 | Do. |
| To replace trucks at field experiment stations (nonrecurring). | +11,500 | Do. |
| For repair, reconditioning and improvement of facilities at six field statious (nonrecurring). | +100,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,000 | Do. |
| Diseases of animals: | | |
| To strengthen research work on brucellosis of cattle and swine. | +30,000 | Do. |
| For additional personnel to properly care for experimental animals. | +21,500 | Do. |
| For additional work on Newcastle disease of poultry | +50,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring items provided in 1947 act for construction at the Agricultural Research Center. | −105,000 | Do. |
| For improvements to heating plant at the Agricultural Research Center (nonrecurring). | +40,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,500 | Do. |
| Inspection and quarantine: | | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring portion of the $85,000 supplemental appropriation for 1947 to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, in the Carribean. | −75,000 | Approved. and further reductions totaling $114,803 imposed, $81,806 relating to controls over interstate shipments of livestock and $32,997 against the function of supervising the importation of animal byproducts. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +15,000 | |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY—continued | | |
| Meat inspection: | | |
| For additional veterinarians and lay inspectors | +$500,000 | Reduction of $6,140,000 imposed below budget estimate. Committee recommends a $5,000,000 working capital fund with provision placing the service on a self-supporting basis. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +240,000 | |
| Virus-Serum-Toxin Act | | General reduction of $50,000 imposed. |
| Marketing agreements, hog-cholera virus and serum (transfer): | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | [+500] | Approved. |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: | | |
| Decrease in funds available to meet emergencies arising from outbreaks of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals (budget carries $100,000 token appropriation and language making any funds in the Department available for such work pending appropriation of funds for the purpose). | −205,000 | Budget proposal approved. |
| Elimination of special 1947 appropriation | −9,000,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For analyzing experimental breeding data | +10,000 | General reduction of $75,000 imposed against budget project to which these items relate. |
| To meet increased operating costs, particularly dairy feeds. | +25,188 | |
| For adequate enforcement of the Process Butter Act | +7,000 | Approved. |
| | | Further reduction of $50,000 imposed below Budget, $25,000 against the nutritional project and $25,000 against the project relating to investigations of milk and its products. |
| BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING | | |
| Field crops: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +125,000 | Approved. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +36,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −71,400 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +31,100 | Do. |
| Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +125,000 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +33,700 | Do. |
| For repair and installation of utilities at Agricultural Research Center (nonrecurring). | +180,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −165,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +26,000 | Do. |
| Forest diseases: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +20,000 | Allowed, except for $5,050 pertaining to work on diseases of young natural stands and plantations which the committee has eliminated entirely by a total reduction of $80,720 below the Budget. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +6,800 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,600 | |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING—continued | | |
| Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +$50,000 | General reduction of $100,000 below Budget imposed under the general project for soil improvement, management, and irrigation research. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +17,500 | Reduction of $50,000 imposed in estimate for work on fertilizers. |
| To replace worn-out equipment (nonrecurring) | +23,500 | Approved. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −50,000 | Do. |
| Agricultural engineering: | | |
| For additional field labor, supplies, and other operating needs to assure continued effectiveness of research program. | +30,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +7,300 | Do. |
| Elimination of nonrecurring item provided in 1947 Act for repair of physical facilities at field stations. | −37,300 | Do. |
| National Arboretum: | | |
| For preparation of detailed plans and specifications for buildings and other physical facilities (nonrecurring). | +150,000 | Disallowed. |
| For acquisition of land on which options will expire in July 1947 (nonrecurring). | +350,000 | Approved. |
| For construction of roads (nonrecurring) | +117,000 | Disallowed. |
| For utilities which should be installed concurrently with the proposed road construction (nonrecurring). | +57,100 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +1,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE | | |
| Insect investigations: | | |
| To strengthen investigations on forest insects in western States. | +35,000 | Do. |
| To reestablish the parasite receiving station at Hoboken, N. J. | +17,000 | Do. |
| To study effectiveness of new insecticidal materials | +23,000 | General reduction of $47,900 below estimate for "Control investigations" work. |
| To determine methods of deinsecticizing planes and other carriers and their cargoes. | +50,000 | |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +45,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +30,500 | Approved. Reductions below budget imposed: $82,100 against work on insects affecting man and animals, and $58,700 against insect identification and classification. |
| Insect and plant-disease control: | | |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +78,500 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +36,900 | $22,600 allowed. Reductions below budget imposed: Dutch elm disease, $269,900; pink bollworm project, $500,000. |
| Foreign plant quarantines: | | |
| For inspection of plants and plant products moving into the continental United States by air traffic. | +214,000 | Approved. |
| To replace worn-out automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +10,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +34,000 | Do. |
| Control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases. | | Reduction of $750,000 below Budget imposed, $500,000 against the reserve fund and $250,000 against pear psylla control. |
| TUSSOCK MOTH CONTROL | | |
| Elimination of special item provided in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. | −395,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY | | |
| Regional research laboratories: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +$80,000 | Approved. |
| BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| To provide for prompt dissemination and application of results of scientific investigations in human nutrition and home economics. | +25,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,000 | Do. |
| WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL | | |
| Reduction in eradication program, as follows: | | Approved, and a reduction of $250,000 imposed in the project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction. |
| State and privately-owned lands | −1,310,761 | |
| National forests | −624,821 | |
| Interior Department lands | −64,418 | |
| FOREST SERVICE | | |
| General administrative expenses | | General cut of $32,000 imposed. |
| National forest protection and management: | | |
| Strengthen fire control work | +300,000 | Approved. |
| For timber sales work | +600,000 | Disallowed. |
| (Decrease arising from elimination of special transfer to this appropriation in 1947 from the item "Acquisition of lands for national forests" (timber sales), contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947). | −410,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +324,000 | Approved, except as may be affected by the following reductions below the Budget: General management, etc. $500,000; Maintenance of improvements 100,000; Protection of wildlife resources (eliminates project) 162,813; Land-use management 182,296; 945,109 |
| Fighting forest fires: | | |
| Decrease arising from the fact that the usual annual deficiency has been provided for 1947, whereas 1948 budget includes only the customary token appropriation of $100,000. | −3,944,000 | Approved. |
| Forest and range management investigations: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +45,000 | Reduction of $200,000 below budget imposed against the forest-management project. |
| Forest products | | Reduction of $555,000 imposed. |
| Forest resources investigations | | Reduction of $500,000 imposed. |
| Forest fire cooperation: | | |
| For cooperative fire protection on State and private lands (provides $9,000,000 as authorized for 1948). | +700,000 | Approved. |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests: | | |
| Reduction in level of program (Weeks Act) | −2,000,000 | Approved, and further reduction of $500,000 imposed. |
| (Increase arising from elimination of special transfer from this appropriation in 1947 to the item "National forest protection and management," contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.) | +410,000 | Approved. |
| Control of tree insect epidemics, national forests: | | |
| Elimination of special item provided in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. | −282,500 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS | | |
| Forest highways | −$2,414,222 | Approved, and further reduction of $6,000,000 imposed. |
| Forest road development | | Reduction of $2,500,000 imposed. |
| FLOOD CONTROL | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation—budget estimate and available prior year balances will provide approximately $2,519,000 (a reduction of about $1,000,000 below 1947). | −1,600,000 | Approved. |
| SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE | | |
| Soil conservation research: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,200 | Approved, and general reduction of $750,000 imposed. |
| Reduction in water regulation investigations, Everglades region of Florida. | −13,200 | |
| Soil conservation operations: | | |
| To provide technical and other assistance to additional conservation districts in the planning and application of soil and water conservation farming practices. | +2,205,000 | Approved. |
| Elimination of funds provided in 1947 act to purchase Government surplus equipment. | −2,500,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of funds for cooperation with other agencies in areas to be incorporated within conservation districts. | −188,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +620,000 | Approved, except as may be affected by committee reduction of $5,437,000 below budget, to be applied primarily to national, regional, State, and district offices (none against nurseries). |
| LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND | | |
| To complete construction of the Little Grassy Dam in Southern Illinois (nonrecurring). | +237,200 | General cut of $1,660,000 below Budget imposed. |
| To reconstruct and repair spillways and other structures on six dams located on land-utilization projects (nonrecurring). | +1,458,600 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +5,200 | |
| WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS | | |
| Elimination of direct appropriation (prior year balances which are available until expended will provide about $1,042,000 for this program in 1948). | −700,000 | Approved. |
| PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION | | |
| CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES | | |
| Decrease in direct appropriation and reappropriations | [−112,526,000] | Transfer from sec. 32 funds disallowed; $117,520,754 reduction below budget for program expenses, including elimination of aerial photographic laboratory; $18,584,956 reduction in administrative expenses (no cut in tobacco marketing quota program expenses). Planning authorization for a 1948 conservation program eliminated. |
| Proposed transfer from section 32 funds | [+100,000,000] | |
| Net decrease in funds available, as detailed below | [−12,526,000] | |
| Elimination of a special item for legume and grass seed production. | −12,500,000 | Approved. |
| Elimination of non-recurring item provided in 1947 Act to restore funds for advance purchases of conservation materials and services. | −600,000 | Do. |
| For administrative expenses in connection with the tobacco marketing quota program. | +574,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | |
| SUGAR ACT | | |
| For payments to sugar producers | +$1,426,988 | Approved. |
| For increased costs for service performed by personnel of county associations. | +75,000 | Do. |
| Elimination of transfers to the Treasury Department | −6,130 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +4,142 | Reduction of $50,000 below budget estimate for national office expenses, the $50,000 being available for payments. |
| NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT | −6,000,000 | Reduction of $30,000,000 below the $75,000,000 budget. |
| ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS | | New item of $525,300 inserted by committee to continue activities relating to the Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, presently financed with section 32 funds which the committee bill rescinds in full for 1948. |
| MARKETING SERVICES | | |
| Market news service: | | |
| For market news on livestock, meats and wool | +11,000 | Approved. |
| For market news on fruits and vegetables | +23,000 | Do. |
| For market news on dairy and poultry products | +16,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +19,028 | Do. |
| Market inspection of farm products: | | |
| For inspection and certification of fresh and processed fruits and vegetables. | +15,000 | Do. |
| To provide for farmers a soybean and flaxseed testing service. | +15,000 | Do. |
| To provide a wool testing service for grease wools | +70,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +16,000 | Do. |
| Marketing farm products: | | |
| Elimination of regulations, allocations, controls, pricing, the wage stabilization and food industry labor programs, and other activities which were necessary for the period immediately following the war. | −1,121,615 | Approved, and further reduction of $400,000 imposed (general). |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,115 | |
| Tobacco Acts: | | |
| To extend inspection, grading, and other services to additional auction sales. | +200,000 | Approved. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,000 | Do. |
| Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency, and Standard Container Acts: | | |
| To process an increased volume of complaints and applications for licenses under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. | +50,000 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +4,200 | Do. |
| United States Grain Standards Act: | | |
| To provide Federal supervisory inspection facilities for grain in Grand Forks, N. Dak. | +18,400 | Do. |
| To replace worn-out laboratory, grading, and automotive equipment (nonrecurring). | +41,600 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +13,000 | Do. |
| United States Warehouse Act: | | |
| For initiating work necessary to a determination of rates to be charged by licensed warehousemen. | +35,000 | General reduction of $100,000 below Budget. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +10,000 | |
| Packers and Stockyards Act: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +8,300 | Approved. |
| Naval Stores Act: | | |
| To replace automotive equipment (nonrecurring) | +1,800 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +1,100 | Do. |
| SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR | | |
| Elimination of calendar year 1947 appropriation item. (Note.—Additional funds are pending in Second Deficiency Bill, 1947) | −12,000,000 | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY | | |
| Commodity Exchange Act: | | |
| For supervision of an anticipated increased volume of futures trading. | +$38,052 | Disallowed. |
| For more adequate and frequent audits of records of all registered brokerage firms. | +35,720 | Do. |
| For more frequent examination of trading techniques and records and for assembling evidence for hearing or court proceedings. | +46,228 | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +9,000 | Approved. |
| FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Reduction in amount estimated for farm tenancy loans | −15,000,000 | Entire estimate of $35,000,000 eliminated. |
| Reduction in amount estimated for production and subsistence loans. | −4,000,000 | Approved, and further reduction of $30,000,000 imposed. |
| Elimination of an unobligated balance available for production and subsistence loans in 1947. | −1,611,282 | |
| To establish the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund authorized by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946. | +15,000,000 | $1,000,000 approved for this fund. |
| Net savings in operating costs due to consolidation of Farm Security Administration and Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division of Farm Credit Administration, reduction in the number of borrowers, consolidation of approximately 95 county offices with adjoining offices, and other economies. | −4,973,522 | Reduction of $12,000,000 below budget, allowing a total of $18,000,000. |
| Elimination of rural rehabilitation grant program | −42,324 | |
| Elimination of transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans" to Farm Credit Administration for cost of over-all administration of crop-loan program which was under supervision of FCA until Oct. 31, 1946. | −102,015 | |
| For expenses incident to examining, approving, and servicing approximately 2,250 insured mortgages. | +766,995 | |
| Elimination of transfer to the Treasury Department | −77,434 | |
| RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +50,000 | General reduction of $1,600,000 below budget. |
| Loans: | | |
| Direct appropriation for loans | [+25,000,000] | Disallowed. |
| Decrease in authorization to borrow loan funds from RFC. | [−25,000,000] | RFC borrowing authorization deleted, with provision for borrowings by REA from the Treasury. |
| No change in funds available for loans | [0] | $25,000,000 reduction. |
| The budget proposes a direct appropriation of $25,000,000 for loans, the security for which will provide the necessary collateral margin for borrowings from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with an offsetting decrease in the authorization to borrow from RFC. | | |
| FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| A net decrease of $59,000 in available funds resulting from economies in operations, distributed by sources of funds as follows: | | |
| Direct appropriation | −23,000 | Approved. |
| Assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system. | +100,910 | Do. |
| Elimination of transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans." | [−102,015] | Do. |
| Reimbursements from Reconstruction Finance Corporation. | [−34,895] | Do. |

*Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases*—Continued

**TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS**

| Item | Budget increase (+) or decrease (−), compared with estimated available, 1947 | Recommendation of committee |
|---|---|---|
| FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | |
| For expenses in handling an increased work load in State offices due to greater participation in the program, including processing of insurance contracts and indemnity claims; and to strengthen the adjustment organization to hold losses to a minimum. | +$701,154 | Total amount recommended in bill for 1948 is $1,000,000, accompanied by language limiting its use to continuation of experimental crop insurance, as authorized, and liquidation of 1947 and prior crop year insurance contracts (except experimental insurance contracts). |
| For processing in the branch offices approximately 237,000 additional insurance contracts and 106,000 additional indemnity claims during 1948. | +191,259 | |
| For expenses in headquarters office to improve actuarial data. | +13,713 | |
| For cost of writing approximately 40,000 contracts covering three new trial insurance commodities. | +120,000 | |
| Elimination of nonrecurring expenses on three-year cotton and wheat contracts, and reduction due to discontinuance of trial insurance on corn and tobacco. | −236,270 | |
| For storage costs on commodity stocks to be purchased when premium notes mature on the 1947 crop, and for increased storage costs on commodity inventory carried over from the 1945 and 1946 crops. | +714,000 | |
| Elimination of transfers to the Treasury Department. | −22,821 | |
| Nominal reduction in transfer to "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938." | −368 | |
| For within-grade salary advancements | +59,333 | |
| Appropriation for use by Secretary of Treasury in subscribing to capital stock (net reduction; $20,000,000 appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, against $10,000,000 recommended for 1948). | −10,000,000 | Approved. |
| COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION | | |
| Administrative expenses from Corporation funds: | | |
| Discontinuance and liquidation of beef and dairy production and sheep and lamb subsidy programs. | [−2,579,000] | Do. |
| Liquidation of certain foreign contract settlement activities. | [−300,000] | Do. |
| Elimination of transfers to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Library. | [−81,000] | Do. |
| For administration of price support programs | [+2,540,650] | Do. |
| For within-grade salary advancements | [+109,350] | Do. |

**TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION**

NOTE.—In addition, the committee bill recommends, under title III, that the permanent appropriation for 1948 under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, be rescinded. It is estimated in the 1948 budget at $148,000,000; a more current estimate is $149,000,000.

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED FOR 1947, THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1948, AND THE AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE ACCOMPANYING BILL FOR 1948

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

### TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 [1] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Office of the Secretary (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *$87, 560* | *$87, 560* | *$87, 560* | | |
| Direct appropriation | [2] 2, 031, 650 | 2, 150, 000 | 2, 050, 000 | +$18, 350 | −$100, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 119, 210* | *2, 237, 560* | *2, 137, 560* | *+18, 350* | *−100, 000* |
| Penalty mail (sec. 2, Public Law 364, 78th Cong.) | 3, 186, 000 | 3, 686, 000 | 3, 186, 000 | | −500, 000 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | | 19, 000, 000 | 6, 000, 000 | +6, 000, 000 | −13, 000, 000 |
| Office of Solicitor (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *136, 000* | *136, 000* | *136, 000* | | |
| Direct appropriation | 2, 479, 000 | 2, 525, 000 | 2, 425, 000 | −54, 000 | −100, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 615, 000* | *2, 661, 000* | *2, 561, 000* | *−54, 000* | *−100, 000* |
| Office of Information: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *13, 710* | *13, 975* | *13, 975* | *+265* | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct appropriation | [3] 661, 050 | 700, 000 | 575, 000 | −86, 050 | −125, 000 |
| *Total* | *674, 760* | *713, 975* | *588, 975* | *−85, 785* | *−125, 000* |
| Printing and binding: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *185, 000* | *170, 000* | *95, 300* | *−89, 700* | *−74, 700* |
| Direct appropriation | 1, 310, 600 | 1, 607, 000 | 1, 607, 000 | +296, 400 | |
| *Total* | *1, 495, 600* | *1, 777, 000* | *1, 702, 300* | *+206, 700* | *−74, 700* |
| *Total, Office of Information* | *2, 170, 360* | *2, 490, 975* | *2, 291, 275* | *+120, 915* | *−199, 700* |
| Library (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *850* | | | *−850* | |
| Direct appropriation | 618, 000 | 660, 000 | 660, 000 | +42, 000 | |
| *Total* | *618, 850* | *660, 000* | *660, 000* | *+41, 150* | |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics: | | | | | |
| Economic investigations: | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *80, 150* | | | *−80, 150* | |
| Direct appropriation | 2, 413, 457 | 2, 493, 600 | 1, 743, 600 | −669, 857 | −750, 000 |
| *Total* | *2, 493, 607* | *2, 493, 600* | *1, 743, 600* | *−750, 007* | *−750, 000* |

[1] Individual amounts in this column include provision for additional funds to meet costs arising from the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390), by transfer from other appropriations currently available pursuant to authorization in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[2] For comparability with the budget estimate, excludes a total of $16,850 proposed for transfer in 1948, as follows: $12,550 to "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information" (for accounting and fiscal functions), and $4,300 to "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service" (for accounting and fiscal functions). Committee approves.

[3] For comparability with the budget estimate, includes $12,550 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Continued | | | | | |
| Crop and livestock estimates (direct appropriation) | [4] $2,375,450 | $2,375,400 | $2,375,400 | −$50 | |
| *Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics* | *4,869,057* | *4,869,000* | *4,119,000* | *−750,057* | *−$750,000* |
| Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (salaries and expenses) | 728,000 | 728,000 | 628,000 | −100,000 | −100,000 |
| International Production Control Committees [5] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [ ] | [ ] |
| Extension Service: | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | |
| Capper-Ketcham Act | 1,480,000 | 1,480,000 | 1,480,000 | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act, title II: | | | | | |
| Sec. 21 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | | |
| Sec. 23 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional extension work | 555, 000 | 555, 000 | 555, 000 | | |
| Alaska | 23, 950 | 23, 950 | 23, 950 | | |
| Puerto Rico | 140, 000 | 274, 000 | 274, 000 | +134, 000 | |
| Total, payments to States | 22, 698, 950 | 22, 832, 950 | 22, 832, 950 | +134, 000 | |
| Salaries and expenses: Administration and coordination of extension work | [6] 827, 200 | 827, 200 | 827, 200 | | |
| Total, Extension Service | [7] 23, 526, 150 | [7] 23, 660, 150 | [7] 23, 660, 150 | +134, 000 | |
| Agricultural Research Administration: | | | | | |
| Office of Administrator (salaries and expenses) | 523, 500 | 481, 500 | 481, 500 | −42,.000 | |
| Special Research Fund | 1, 303, 000 | 1, 303, 000 | 1, 203, 000 | −100, 000 | −100, 000 |
| Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials (Rubber investigations) | | 349, 000 | 349, 000 | +349, 000 | |
| Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska | | | [8] 144, 940 | +144, 940 | +144, 940 |

[4] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $3,450 proposed transfer in 1948 from the appropriation "Naval stores investigations," Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry (for naval stores statistics work). Committee approves.

[5] Authorization to transfer funds for this purpose from the appropriation made by sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 ($8,500) and from the appropriation for the Sugar Act ($4,000).

[6] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $4,300 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.

[7] In addition, $4,704,710 is available for payments to States by permanent appropriation without annual action of Congress.

[8] Includes $144,940 transferred by the committee from the appropriations for payments to States and Territories for agricultural experiment stations.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Office of Experiment Stations: | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | |
| Hatch Act | $720, 000 | $720, 000 | $720, 000 | | |
| Adams Act | 720, 000 | 720, 000 | 720, 000 | | |
| Purnell Act | 2, 880, 000 | 2, 880 000 | 2, 880, 000 | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act | 2, 663, 708 | 2, 663, 708 | 2, 661, 268 | [8a] −$2, 440 | [8a] −$2, 440 |
| Hawaii | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | | |
| Alaska | 42, 500 | 42, 500 | | [8a] −42, 500 | [8a] −42, 500 |
| Puerto Rico | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | 90, 000 | | |
| Total, payments to States | 7, 206, 208 | 7, 206, 208 | 7, 161, 268 | −44, 940 | −44, 940 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Administration of grants and coordination of research with States | 194, 000 | 211, 000 | 211, 000 | +17, 000 | |
| Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico | 177, 200 | 114, 700 | 114, 700 | −62, 500 | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 371, 200 | 325, 700 | 325, 700 | −45, 500 | |
| Total, Office of Experiment Stations | 7, 577, 408 | 7, 531, 908 | 7, 486, 968 | −90, 440 | −44, 940 |
| Bureau of Animal Industry: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Animal husbandry | 1, 136, 500 | 1, 305, 500 | 1, 305, 500 | +169, 000 | |
| Diseases of animals | 1, 000, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | +45, 000 | |
| Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease | 6, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | | |
| Inspection and quarantine | [9] 1, 400, 000 | 1, 340, 000 | 1, 225, 197 | −174, 803 | −114, 803 |
| Meat inspection | 10, 400, 000 | 11, 140, 000 | [10] 5, 000, 000 | −5, 400, 000 | −6, 140, 000 |
| Virus Serum Toxin Act | 340, 000 | 340, 000 | 290, 000 | −50, 000 | −50, 000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 21, 026, 500 | 21, 920, 500 | 15, 615, 697 | −5, 410, 803 | −6, 304, 803 |

[8a] Transferred to appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska."
[9] Includes $141,000 appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.
[10] To be established as a working capital fund for a meat inspection service which the committee bill would place on a completely self-supporting basis.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Bureau of Animal Industry—Continued | | | | | |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | [11] $9,000,000 | $100,000 | $100,000 | −$8,900,000 | |
| Reappropriation | 305,000 | | | −305,000 | |
| Total, eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | 9,305,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | −9,205,000 | |
| Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum [12] | [42,500] | [43,000] | [43,000] | [+500] | [ ] |
| Total, including reappropriation | 30,331,500 | 22,020,500 | 15,715,697 | −14,615,803 | −$6,304,803 |
| *Deduct* reappropriation | 305,000 | | | −305,000 | |
| Total, Bureau of Animal Industry, excluding reappropriation | 30,026,500 | 22,020,500 | 15,715,697 | −14,310,803 | −6,304,803 |
| Bureau of Dairy Industry (salaries and expenses) | [13] 1,093,812 | 1,136,000 | 1,011,000 | −82,812 | −125,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| Field crops | 2, 663, 300 | 2, 784, 000 | 2, 784, 000 | +120, 700 | |
| Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops | 2, 245, 300 | 2, 445, 000 | 2, 445, 000 | +199, 700 | |
| Forest diseases | 407, 600 | 440, 000 | 359, 280 | −48, 320 | −80, 720 |
| Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation | 1, 500, 000 | 1, 541, 000 | 1, 391, 000 | −109, 000 | −150, 000 |
| Agricultural engineering | 637, 000 | 637, 000 | 637, 000 | | |
| National Arboretum | 85, 900 | 761, 000 | 436, 900 | +351, 000 | −324, 100 |
| Total | 7, 539, 100 | 8, 608, 000 | 8, 053, 180 | +514, 080 | −554, 820 |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Insect investigations | 2, 949, 500 | 3, 150, 000 | 2, 961, 300 | +11, 800 | −188, 700 |
| Insect and plant disease control | 3, 351, 600 | 3, 467, 000 | 2, 697, 100 | −654, 500 | −769, 900 |
| Foreign plant quarantines | 1, 742, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | +258, 000 | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 8, 043, 100 | 8, 617, 000 | 7, 658, 400 | −384, 700 | −958, 600 |
| Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases | 2, 800, 000 | 2, 800, 000 | 2, 050, 000 | −750, 000 | −750, 000 |
| Total | 10, 843, 100 | 11, 417, 000 | 9, 708, 400 | −1, 134, 700 | −1, 708, 600 |
| Tussock Moth Control | 395, 000 | (14) | | −395, 000 | |

[11] Appropriated by H. J. Res. 154, 80th Cong. (Public Law 22); available until June 30, 1948.
[12] Transfer from the appropriation made bv Sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933.
[13] Includes $10,000 appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.
[14] Balance of this appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1947.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | |
| Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Agricultural chemical investigations | $511, 500 | $511, 500 | $511, 500 | | |
| Naval stores investigations | [15] 152, 550 | 152, 550 | 152, 550 | | |
| Regional research laboratories | 4, 920, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | +$80, 000 | |
| Total | 5, 584, 050 | 5, 664, 050 | 5, 664, 050 | +80, 000 | |
| Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (salaries and expenses) | 1, 007, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | 1, 045, 000 | +38, 000 | |
| White-Pine Blister-Rust Control: | | | | | |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine | 2, 754, 111 | 1, 443, 350 | 1, 193, 350 | −1, 560, 761 | −$250, 000 |
| Forest Service | 2, 599, 471 | 1, 974, 650 | 1, 974, 650 | −624, 821 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of the Interior | 646, 418 | 582, 000 | 582, 000 | −64, 418 | |
| Total | 6, 000, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | 3, 750, 000 | −2, 250, 000 | −250, 000 |
| Forest Service: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| General administrative expenses | 682, 000 | 682, 000 | 650, 000 | −32, 000 | −32, 000 |
| National forest protection and management | [16] 24, 496, 000 | 25, 310, 000 | 23, 764, 891 | −731, 109 | −1, 545, 109 |
| Fighting forest fires | [17] 4, 044, 000 | 100, 000 | 100, 000 | −3, 944, 000 | |
| Forest and range-management investigations | 2, 630, 000 | 2, 675, 000 | 2, 475, 000 | −155, 000 | −200, 000 |
| Forest products | 1, 555, 000 | 1, 555, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | −555, 000 | −555, 000 |
| Forest-resources investigations | 1, 072, 000 | 1, 072, 000 | 572, 000 | −500, 000 | −500, 000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 34, 479, 000 | 31, 394, 000 | 28, 561, 891 | −5, 917, 109 | −2, 832, 109 |
| Forest-fire cooperation | 8, 300, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | +700, 000 | |
| Farm and other private forestry cooperation | 809, 500 | 809, 500 | 809, 500 | | |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests | [16] 2, 590, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | 500, 000 | −2, 090, 000 | −500, 000 |
| Acquisition of lands from national forest receipts | 142, 000 | 142, 000 | 142, 000 | | |

[15] For comparability with the Budget estimate, excludes $3,450 proposed transfer in 1948 to the appropriation "Crop and livestock estimates," Bureau of Agricultural Economics (naval stores statistics work).

[16] These figures reflect a transfer of $410,000 from "Acquisition of lands for national forests" to "National forest protection and management" (for timber sales work) as authorized by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[17] Includes $3,944,000 appropriated by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the usual fire-fighting deficiency requirements.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Forest Service—Continued | | | | | |
| Control of tree insect epidemics, national forests | $282, 500 | ([18]) | ---------- | −$282, 500 | ---------- |
| Total, Forest Service | [19] 46, 603, 000 | [19] $42, 345, 500 | [19] $39, 013, 391 | −7, 589, 609 | −$3, 332, 109 |
| Forest Roads and Trails: | | | | | |
| Forest highways | 13, 714, 222 | 11, 300, 000 | 5, 300, 000 | −8, 414, 222 | −6, 000, 000 |
| Forest development roads | 12, 500, 000 | 12, 500, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | −2, 500, 000 | −2, 500, 000 |
| Total, forest roads and trails | 26, 214, 222 | 23, 800, 000 | 15, 300, 000 | −10, 914, 222 | −8, 500, 000 |
| Flood Control | [20] 2, 100, 000 | [20] 500, 000 | [20] 500, 000 | −1, 600, 000 | ---------- |
| Soil Conservation Service: | | | | | |
| Soil conservation research | 1, 423, 000 | 1, 423, 000 | 673, 000 | −750, 000 | −750, 000 |
| Soil conservation operations | 43, 300, 000 | 43, 437, 000 | 38, 000, 000 | −5, 300, 000 | −5, 437, 000 |
| Total, Soil Conservation Service | 44, 723, 000 | 44, 860, 000 | 38, 673, 000 | −6, 050, 000 | −6, 187, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Land Utilization and Retirement of Submarginal Land (title III, Farm Tenant Act) | [21] 1,559,000 | [21] 3,260,000 | [21] 1,600,000 | +41,000 | −1,660,000 |
| Water conservation and utilization projects | 700,000 | (22) | (22) | −700,000 | |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | | | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation (excludes special seed program) | 259,246,000 | 201,720,000 | 165,614,290 | −93,631,710 | −36,105,710 |
| Special seed program | 12,500,000 | | | −12,500,000 | |
| Reappropriation from sec. 32 balances | 42,500,000 | | | −42,500,000 | |
| Transfer from 1948, sec. 32 funds | | 100,000,000 | (23) | | [23] −100,000,000 |
| Total | 314,246,000 | 301,720,000 | 165,614,290 | −148,631,710 | −136,105,710 |
| *Deduct* reappropriation and transfer | −42,500,000 | −100,000,000 | | −42,500,000 | [23] −100,000,000 |
| Total, conservation and use, excluding reappropriation and transfer | 271,746,000 | 201,720,000 | 165,614,290 | −106,131,710 | −36,105,710 |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item: | | | | | |
| National and State expenses (1947 amount includes provision for pay costs under Public Law 390) | [8,871,868] | [9,095,868] | [1,950,000] | [−6,921,868] | [−7,145,868] |

[18] Balance of the appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1947.
[19] In addition, permanent appropriations are available as indicated at the end of this table.
[20] In addition, prior year balances are available for use.
[21] In addition, a permanent appropriation is available as indicated at the end of this table.
[22] To be financed in 1948 from prior year balance (*estimated* in the Budget at $1,042,576).
[23] The committee bill recommends rescission of the full amount of the sec. 32 appropriation for 1948.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Production and Marketing Administration—Continued | | | | | |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item—Continued | | | | | |
| County associations | [$20, 039, 088] | [$24, 489, 088] | [$13, 050, 000] | [−$6, 989, 088] | [−$11, 439, 088] |
| Total, administrative expense limitation | [28, 910, 956] | [33, 584, 956] | [15, 000, 000] | [−13, 910, 956] | [−18, 584, 956] |
| Sugar Act | 53, 500, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | +1, 500, 000 | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32 funds): | | | | | |
| Reappropriation | 65, 568, 710 | | | −65, 568, 710 | |
| National School Lunch Act | [24] 81, 000, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | 45, 000, 000 | −36, 000, 000 | −30, 000, 000 |
| *Deduct* transfer in 1947 from sec. 32 funds | −75, 000, 000 | | | −75, 000, 000 | |
| Total, National School Lunch Act, excluding transfer | 6, 000, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | 45, 000, 000 | +39, 000, 000 | −30, 000, 000 |
| Administration of marketing agreements and orders | ([25]) | ([25]) | 525, 300 | +525, 300 | +525, 300 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing services: | | | | | |
| Market news service | 1,450,972 | 1,520,000 | 1,520,000 | +69,028 | |
| Market inspection of farm products | 596,000 | 712,000 | 712,000 | +116,000 | |
| Marketing farm products | 2,511,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,000,000 | −1,511,500 | −400,000 |
| Tobacco Acts | 1,344,000 | 1,552,000 | 1,552,000 | +208,000 | |
| Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency and Standard Container Acts | 239,800 | 294,000 | 294,000 | +54,200 | |
| Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | | |
| United States Grain Standards Act | 1,055,000 | 1,128,000 | 1,128,000 | +73,000 | |
| United States Warehouse Act | 640,000 | 685,000 | 585,000 | −55,000 | −100,000 |
| Federal Seed Act | 152,500 | 152,500 | 152,500 | | |
| Packers and Stockyards Act | 519,700 | 528,000 | 528,000 | +8,300 | |
| Naval Stores Act | 38,100 | 41,000 | 41,000 | +2,900 | |
| Insecticide Act | 293,500 | 293,500 | 293,500 | | |
| Freight rates for farm products | 138,000 | 138,000 | 138,000 | | |
| Total, marketing services | 10,378,072 | 9,843,000 | 9,343,000 | −1,035,072 | −500,000 |
| Supply and distribution of farm labor | [26] 12,000,000 | | | −12,000,000 | |

[24] Includes $6,000,000 appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.
[25] Included under the sec. 32 permanent appropriation which the committee bill rescinds for 1948; new appropriation item is recommended to provide for administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.
[26] Appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (calendar year appropriation; presently available until December 31, 1947, under the terms of Public Law 40, 80th Cong., which also provides for liquidation of the program within 30 days thereafter). Additional funds pending in Second Deficiency Bill, 1947.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Commodity Exchange Authority: | | | | | |
| Commodity Exchange Act | $521, 000 | $650, 000 | $530, 000 | +$9, 000 | −$120, 000 |
| Farmers Home Administration: | | | | | |
| Farm tenant loans | 50, 000, 000 | 35, 000, 000 | | −50, 000, 000 | −35, 000, 000 |
| Production and subsistence loans | [27] 95, 611, 282 | 90, 000, 000 | 60, 000, 000 | −35, 611, 282 | −30, 000, 000 |
| Farm tenant mortgage insurance fund | | 15, 000, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | +1, 000, 000 | −14, 000, 000 |
| Salaries and expenses | [28] 34, 428, 300 | 30, 000, 000 | 18, 000, 000 | −16, 428, 300 | −12, 000, 000 |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration | 180, 039, 582 | 170, 000, 000 | 79, 000, 000 | −101, 039, 582 | −91, 000, 000 |
| *Deduct*— | | | | | |
| Reappropriations | −25, 410, 582 | | | +25, 410, 582 | |
| RFC loan authorizations | −120, 000, 000 | | | +120, 000, 000 | |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration, direct appropriations | 34, 629, 000 | 170, 000, 000 | 79, 000, 000 | +44, 371, 000 | −91, 000, 000 |
| Water Facilities, Arid and Semiarid Areas | 1, 750, 000 | 1, 750, 000 | 1, 750, 000 | | |
| Rural Electrification Administration: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 5, 550, 000 | 5, 600, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | −1, 550, 000 | −1, 600, 000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loans: | | | | | |
| Loan authorization | 250, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −25, 000, 000 | |
| Direct appropriation | | 25, 000, 000 | | | −25, 000, 000 |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration | 255, 550, 000 | 255, 600, 000 | 229, 000, 000 | −26, 550, 000 | −26, 600, 000 |
| *Deduct* loan authorization | −250, 000, 000 | −225, 000, 000 | −225, 000, 000 | +25, 000, 000 | |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration direct appropriation | 5, 550, 000 | 30, 600, 000 | 4, 000, 000 | −1, 550, 000 | −26, 600, 000 |
| Farm Credit Administration (salaries and expenses): | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | 584, 000 | 561, 000 | 561, 000 | −23, 000 | |
| Assessments against member institutions of the farm credit system | [29] 2, 680, 090 | [29] 2, 781, 000 | [29] 2, 781, 000 | +100, 910 | |
| Transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans" | [102, 015] | [ ] | [ ] | [−102, 015] | [ ] |
| Total, Farm Credit Administration, direct appropriations | 3, 264, 090 | 3, 342, 000 | 3, 342, 000 | +77, 910 | |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, and transfers from permanent appropriations (title I) | 1, 211, 243, 503 | 1, 110, 811, 608 | 783, 713, 866 | −427, 529, 637 | −327, 097, 742 |

[27] Consists of funds originally made available for rural rehabilitation and crop-production and harvesting loans which were combined pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946. A portion of the total represents estimated collections during fiscal year 1947; thus the figure is subject to revision based on actual collections.

[28] Consists of funds originally made available for expenses in connection with the rural rehabilitation, farm tenant, and crop-production and harvesting loan programs, which have been reorganized and integrated under the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946.

[29] *Estimated* assessments. Subject to revision.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE II.—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: | | | | | |
| Operating expenses (appropriation) | $7, 790, 000 | $9, 330, 000 | $1, 000, 000 | −$6, 790, 000 | −$8, 330, 000 |
| Appropriation for use of Secretary of Treasury in subscribing to capital stock | [30] 20, 000, 000 | [31] 10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | −10, 000, 000 | ---------- |
| Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 11, 000, 000 | −16, 790, 000 | −8, 330, 000 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation (limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds) | [8, 760, 000] | [[32] 8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [----------] |
| Total appropriations (title II) | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 11, 000, 000 | −16, 790, 000 | −8, 330, 000 |

**TOTALS, ALL TITLES**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totals: | | | | | |
| Direct appropriations | 660, 249, 211 | 805, 141, 608 | 569, 713, 866 | −90, 535, 345 | −235, 427, 742 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | ---------- | ---------- | −133, 784, 292 | ---------- |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −145, 000, 000 | |
| Transfer of funds from permanent appropriations | 75, 000, 000 | 100, 000, 000 | | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds | [8, 760, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [ ] |
| Grand totals, excluding net permanent appropriations | 1, 239, 033, 503 | 1, 130, 141, 608 | 794, 713, 866 | −444, 319, 637 | −335, 427, 742 |
| *Add* net total for permanent appropriations shown in table following | 52, 747, 348 | 58, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −42, 317, 638 | −48, 000, 000 |
| Grand totals, including permanents | 1, 291, 780, 851 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 805, 143, 576 | −486, 637, 275 | −383, 427, 742 |
| *Deduct* transfers authorized to be made between existing appropriations to meet pay costs under Public Law 390, 79th Cong | −17, 094, 800 | | | −17, 094, 800 | |
| Grand totals (net) | 1, 274, 686, 051 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 805, 143, 576 | −469, 542, 475 | −383, 427, 742 |

[30] Contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. Originally submitted as a 1948 Budget estimate "to be immediately available."

[31] Additional recommendation contained in H. Doc. 214, 80th Cong.

[32] Represents a revision of the original estimate (see H. Doc. 186, 80th Cong.).

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

**PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS**

[NOTE.—Includes figures on funds recommended for rescission in title III of the accompanying bill]

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Committee bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 |
| Cooperative agricultural extension work | $4, 704, 710 | $4, 704, 710 | $4, 704, 710 | | |
| Payments to States and Territories from national forest fund | [33] 3, 425, 000 | [33] 3, 950, 000 | 3, 950, 000 | +$525, 000 | |
| Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national forest fund | [33] 39, 000 | [33] 39, 000 | 39, 000 | | |
| Roads and trails for States, national forest fund | [33] 1, 370, 000 | [33] 1, 580, 000 | 1, 580, 000 | +210, 000 | |
| Payments to counties, submarginal land program | [33] 156, 000 | [33] 156, 000 | 156, 000 | | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Section 32 funds (see deductions below) | 118, 052, 638 | [33] 148, 000, 000 | ([34]) | −118, 052, 638 | [34] −$148, 000, 000 |
| Total, permanent appropriations | 127, 747, 348 | 158, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −117, 317, 638 | −148, 000, 000 |
| *Deduct* transfers from sec. 32 funds to "National School Lunch Act" in 1947 and to "Conservation and use" in 1948 | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 | | −75, 000, 000 | −100, 000, 000 |
| Net total for permanents, excluding transfers | 52, 747, 348 | 58, 429, 710 | 10, 429, 710 | −42, 317, 638 | −48, 000, 000 |

## REAPPROPRIATIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | $305, 000 | | | −$305, 000 | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | 42, 500, 000 | | | −42, 500, 000 | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (Section 32 funds) | [33] 65, 568, 710 | | | −65, 568, 710 | |
| Farmers' Home Administration | [33] 25, 410, 582 | | | −25, 410, 582 | |
| Total, reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | | | −133, 784, 292 | |

## LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farm tenancy loans | $50, 000, 000 | | | −$50, 000, 000 | |
| Production and subsistence loans | 70, 000, 000 | | | −70, 000, 000 | |
| Rural electrification loans | 250, 000, 000 | $225, 000, 000 | $225, 000, 000 | −25, 000, 000 | |
| Total loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | −145, 000, 000 | |

[33] Preliminary figures. Subject to revision.
[34] Committee bill recommends rescission of the full amount of this permanent appropriation for 1948.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

**TRUST FUNDS**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947[35] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Forest Service: | | | |
| Cooperative work | $3, 500, 000 | $3, 500, 000 | |
| Construction of forest access roads to standing timber | 11, 300, 000 | | −$11, 300, 000 |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | |
| Moisture content and grade determinations | 1, 354, 000 | 1, 354, 000 | |
| Indemnity fund, county associations | 2, 000 | 2, 000 | |
| Undistributed cotton price-adjustment payments | 300 | 300 | |
| Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products | 5, 600, 000 | 5, 000, 000 | −600, 000 |
| Grading of agricultural commodities | 800, 000 | 754, 000 | −46, 000 |
| Farmers' Home Administration: | | | |
| Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects | 55, 000 | | −55, 000 |
| State rural rehabilitation corporation funds | 9, 250, 000 | 9, 000, 000 | −250, 000 |
| Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts | 100, 000 | 50, 000 | −50, 000 |
| Miscellaneous contributed funds | 159, 530 | 229, 000 | +69, 470 |
| Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps | 2, 914 | 2, 600 | −314 |
| Unearned fees and other charges, unclaimed moneys, etc | 200 | 200 | |
| Total, trust accounts | 32, 123, 944 | 19, 892, 100 | −12, 231, 844 |

[35] Figures in several cases are preliminary and subject to revision based on actual amounts finally made available for the year.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JOHN PHILLIPS

Having signed the majority report of this committee, I submit these additional views to emphasize the need for economy and efficiency in the Department of Agriculture. The farmers of this Nation have said unmistakenly that they want economy in government, and a balanced budget. I think they mean they want economy and efficiency in the department most closely related to agriculture, as well as in other departments which are related only indirectly to agriculture. The farmers have insistently said for years that they wanted the elimination of the duplications and the confusions of Government departments and agencies.

The appropriation bill, for the Department of Agriculture, is a step toward the end the farmers want. It could have been a longer step. There are units of this Department which requested, in the present budget, three or four times as large appropriations as they received 10 years ago, yet whose services to agriculture generally are less essential today than they were previously. Some such agencies have been cut, in this budget, as little as 15 percent.

There are constant duplications, in the work of various units, throughout the Department. It is difficult for the Committee on Appropriations to do very much about this. It is an administrative job. I strongly urge this upon the Secretary as a problem of first importance. The intent of the Secretary will soon be determined by the application of the cuts taken in this budget. If these are applied only at the lower levels, leaving the Washington levels top-heavy and duplicating, it may be necessary for the Congress, through its proper committees, to attempt the necessary corrections. Several of us on the subcommittee believe that an additional cut in personnel could have been made, specifically applied to the Washington level. Statements that a department "ought to be reorganized," or insistence that "we must remove duplications," and similar comments frequently heard in committees and on the floor, are worthless as long as we continue to appropriate more money than a careful analysis indicates is required by the Department.

The problems of marketing research; of whether the Federal Government or the States should pay the costs of school lunches, or in what proportion; of the REA, or the AAA, or the SCS, or the CCC, will be discussed on the floor of the House during general debate on this bill. In brief, my feeling is that more money could have been cut from the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture and that, properly administered, the results would have benefited agriculture generally. My desire is to see a well-organized Department of Agriculture, with all the money it needs to operate efficiently, but without duplications or unnecessary activities, functioning primarily in the interest of the farmers of the United States of America.

## SUPPLEMENTARY VIEWS OF H. CARL ANDERSEN

I have concurred in the majority report with the following reservations:

A major portion of the cuts effected have been obtained through the reduction in appropriations for AAA, the school-lunch program and the Farm Home Administration, together with reductions of a lesser degree in REA, Research, Forestry, and other branches.

I do not feel that proportionate cuts in personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture have been made consistent with those above-mentioned.

It is my intention to offer on the floor, after careful study, certain amendments designed to secure the balance which is desirable.

H. Carl Andersen.



○

Union Calendar No. 216

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. 450]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 23, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

# A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

# TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For personal services in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the

1 Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be trans-
2 ferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or
3 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
5 the Department shall determine are appropriate to the re-
6 quirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such
7 appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That, of
8 appropriations herein made which are available for the pur-
9 chase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each
10 option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land:
11 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
12 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or
13 employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee,
14 or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission,
15 or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any predic-
16 tion, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threat-
17 ened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future
18 prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further,*
19 That, except to provide materials required in or incident to
20 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
21 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this
22 Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured
23 from commodities or materials produced outside of the United
24 States.

1 PENALTY MAIL

2 For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of
3 the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944
4 (39 U. S. C. 321d), $3,186,000.

5 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

6 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including
8 in addition to the objects for which funds are available for
9 such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bank-
10 head-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration,
12 planning, and coordination of research under section 10
13 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary
14 expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the
15 Act, as follows:

16 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
17 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9
18 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
19 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $3,000,000, of
20 which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be
21 transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research
22 on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching
23 requirement;

24 For research on utilization and associated problems
25 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, $1,000,000;

1 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
2 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
3 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act $1,000,000;
4 For the improvement and development, independently or
5 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
6 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
7 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
8 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
9 14, 1946), $1,000,000;
10 In all, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That such sums as may
11 be necessary for penalty mail as required by the Act of June
12 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular departmental
13 appropriation therefor: *Provided further,* That for necessary
14 printing and binding there may be transferred to, and made
15 a part of, the item "Printing and binding, Department of
16 Agriculture," such sums as are necessary: *Provided further,*
17 That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office,
18 or agency of the Department such amounts from this appro-
19 priation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for
20 which it is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition
21 to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other
22 appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,*
23 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work
24 relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

1 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

2 For necessary expenses, including personal services
3 in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues
4 for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service,
5 $2,425,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
6 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
7 in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
8 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be deter-
9 mined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000
10 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation;
11 and there may be expended for personal services in the
12 District of Columbia not to exceed $1,597,000: *Provided,*
13 *however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations
14 or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any
15 time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respec-
16 tively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts
17 transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appro-
18 priation and the amount which may be expended for per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased
20 or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
21 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
22 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
23 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases
24 in such appropriations or authorizations.

1 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
4 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
5 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
6 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
7 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
8 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
9 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
10 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
11 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
12 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
13 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
14 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
15 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
16 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
17 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
18 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
19 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
20 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
21 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-
22 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
23 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
24 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be

1 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
2 which may be expended for personal services in the District
3 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
4 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
5 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
6 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
7 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
8 tions: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that
9 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
10 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
11 of the various agencies of the Department can be more ad-
12 vantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
13 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
14 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
15 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
16 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
17 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
18 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in
19 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
20 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
21 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
22 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944
23 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
24 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
25 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*

1 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
2 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
3 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
4 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
5 Francisco radio office.

6 PRINTING AND BINDING

7 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
8 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
9 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
10 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
11 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
12 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
13 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
14 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
15 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
16 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
17 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
18 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
19 portion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out
20 under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Repre-
21 sentatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but
22 not including work done at the field printing plants of the
23 Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Print-
24 ing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919

1 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
2 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
3 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
4 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
5 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
6 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
7 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
8 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
9 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
10 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
11 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
12 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
13 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
14 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
15 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
16 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
17 for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
18 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such
19 sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in con-
20 nection therewith: *Provided further,* That the total amount
21 that may be transferred under the authority granted in the
22 preceding proviso shall not exceed $95,300.

23 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

24 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
25 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,

1 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
2 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
3 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
4 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
5 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
6 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
7 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

9 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
10 $1,887,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
11 ncluding the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per
12 annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books
13 of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

14 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
15 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
16 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
17 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation
18 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
19 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
20 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
21 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
22 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
23 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
24 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
25 their variations and trends, $1,743,600: *Provided,* That no

1 part of the funds herein appropriated or made available
2 to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading
3 "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county
4 land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for
5 the maintenance of regional offices.

6 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
7 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
8 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
9 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
10 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
11 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
12 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
13 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
14 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
15 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
16 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided,*
17 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-
18 able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or
19 publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
20 acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
21 production for other than the commercial crop.

22 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
23 RELATIONS

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the
25 Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling

1 the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the
2 Department in connection with foreign agricultural work,
3 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
4 not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $628,000.

5 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
6 COMMITTEES

7 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
8 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
9 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
10 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
11 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
12 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
13 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
14 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
15 thereto.

16 EXTENSION SERVICE

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO
18 RICO

19 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
20 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
21 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
22 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
23 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
24 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7

1 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
2 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
3 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
4 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
5 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
6 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
7 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
8 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
9 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
10 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
11 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
12 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
13 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
14 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
15 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 Administration and coordination of extension work:
18 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
19 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–
20 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
21 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
22 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
23 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
24 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

1 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

2 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
4 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
5 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
7 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
8 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
9 to the Department, from Government surplus without
10 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
11 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
12 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
13 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
14 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
15 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*
16 That the appropriation current at the time services are
17 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
18 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
19 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
20 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
21 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
22 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
23 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
24 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center

1 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
2 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
3 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
4 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
5 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
6 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
7 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
8 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
9 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
10 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
11 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
12 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
13 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
14 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
15 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
16 tor, whichever is greater.

17 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
18 AGRICULTURE

19 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
20 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
21 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
22 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
23 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
24 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by

1 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
2 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
3 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
4 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
5 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
6 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
7 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

8 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
9 MATERIALS

10 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
11 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
12 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
13 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
14 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
15 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
16 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of
17 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
18 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
19 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
20 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
21 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
22 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
23 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
24 $865,000.

1 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

2 To enable the Secretary, through such officers and
3 employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-
4 tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain
5 a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and
6 problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including
7 printing and binding, the employment of personal services
8 in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-
9 tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to
10 restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program
11 the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have
12 heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the
13 Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station
14 of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United
15 States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and
16 with other public and private agencies. The provisions of
17 this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of
18 the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take
19 such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine
20 to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-
21 under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use
22 of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds
23 of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including
24 its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than
25 any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-

1 poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable
2 continue the employment of the existing personnel of the
3 station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-
4 cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby
5 transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-
6 ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for
7 credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the
8 legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-
9 struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-
10 tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be
11 unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall
12 be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-
13 tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the
14 transfer.

15 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

16 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

17 For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico
18 to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the
19 provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
20 experiment stations:

21 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
22 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
23 C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
24 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
25 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382),
2 $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-
3 proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268,
4 none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the
5 Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b),
6 extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the
7 Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act
8 approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–
9 386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress
10 to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,
11 and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 Administration of grants and coordination of research
14 with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
15 $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
16 to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,
17 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928,
18 March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amenda-
19 tory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383,
20 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administratian and for the
21 administration of an agricultural experiment station in
22 Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe
23 the form of the annual financial statement required under the
24 above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accord-
25 ance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of

1 the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the
2 lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department
3 in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

4 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
5 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
6 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
7 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

8 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
11 $1,059,000 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
12 trict of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions of the Act,
13 as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and
14 related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the live-
15 stock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-
16 bearing animals, as follows:

17 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
18 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
19 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
20 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
21 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
22 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
23 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

24 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of

1 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
2 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.
3 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
4 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
5 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
6 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
7 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
8 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-
9 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
10 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
11 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
12 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
13 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
14 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
15 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
16 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That
17 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
18 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
19 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
20 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
21 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
22 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
23 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
24 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
25 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

1 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
2 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
3 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
4 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
5 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
6 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
7 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance
8 with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and
9 the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the in-
10 spection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
11 $1,225,197.

12 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
13 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products,
14 $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States
15 as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to
16 be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall
17 be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an ade-
18 quate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every
19 person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished
20 inspection or service under said laws, including inspection
21 of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export
22 and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products,
23 shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with
24 regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and
25 at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be

1 deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full
2 reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the
3 furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific
4 and technical investigations and laboratory services; investi-
5 gations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions
6 under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; super-
7 visory, administrative, statistical, business management, and
8 other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia
9 and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal
10 Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District
11 of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger
12 motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase
13 of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized
14 by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431);
15 and other necessary expenses: *Provided,* That the Secretary
16 of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of
17 bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the
18 interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-
19 draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges
20 or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-
21 ment: *Provided further,* That inspection or other technical
22 services may be rendered to Government and other public
23 agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein
24 provided: *Provided further,* That a schedule of obligations
25 and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the

1 close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for
2 the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the
3 Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*
4 *further,* That payments shall be made for inspection or service
5 rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

6 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
7 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
8 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
9 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
10 factured in the United States and the importation of such
11 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
12 animals, $290,000.

13 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
14 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
15 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
16 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
17 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
18 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
19 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
20 services in the District of Columbia.

21 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
22 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

23 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-

1 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
2 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
3 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
4 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
5 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
6 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
7 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
8 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar
9 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
10 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
11 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
12 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
13 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
14 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
15 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
16 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
17 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
18 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
19 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
20 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
21 United States Government for any such animals shall not
22 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
23 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
24 appraisal is the same for each bird.

1 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

2 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
3 not to exceed $500,000 for personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act of
5 May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404), including investiga-
6 tions, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry,
7 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May
8 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or
9 renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946
10 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S.
11 C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process
12 or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

13 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
14 ENGINEERING

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
17 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
18 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
19 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
20 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
21 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
22 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
23 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
24 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-

1 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
2 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
3 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
4 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
5 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
6 as follows:

7 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-
8 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn,
9 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
10 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
11 field crops, $2,784,000.

12 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
13 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
14 tables, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
15 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
16 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
17 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
18 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
19 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
20 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
21 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
22 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dale
23 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
24 mately $7,000.

25 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest

1 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
2 control, $359,280.

3 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
4 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
5 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
6 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
7 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural
8 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
9 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
10 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
11 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
12 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
13 cropping and improved soil management; $1,391,000.

14 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
15 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
16 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
17 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
18 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
19 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
20 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
21 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
22 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

23 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
24 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
25 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.

1 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
2 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
3 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
4 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
5 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of
6 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act
7 of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

8 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
12 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means
13 of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agri-
14 culture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
15 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
16 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
17 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
18 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the
19 provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
20 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7
21 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
22 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and
23 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the
24 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
25 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-

1 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
2 and not to exceed $692,000 for personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, as follows:

4 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
5 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
6 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
7 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
8 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
9 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
10 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
11 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
12 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
13 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
14 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
15 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
16 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
17 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
18 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
19 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
20 tion, $2,961,300.

21 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
22 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
23 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
24 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,
25 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal

1 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
2 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
3 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
4 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
5 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
6 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
7 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
8 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
9 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
10 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
11 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
12 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
13 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $2,697,100: *Provided,* That
14 no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or
15 value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property
16 injured or destroyed: *Provided further,* That, in the discre-
17 tion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be
18 expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State
19 until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accom-
20 plish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or
21 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
22 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or
23 local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the
24 accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided further,* That in the
25 discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appro-

1 priation shall be made for applying methods of control of the
2 Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the re-
3 moval and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering
4 from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such
5 removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate
6 for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or
7 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
8 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or
9 local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations con-
10 cerned: *Provided, however,* That expenditures incurred for
11 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
12 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
13 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further,*
14 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
15 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
16 disease except where such trees are located on property
17 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
18 or on property included within local experimental control
19 areas.

20 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
21 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
22 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
23 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
24 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7

1 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
2 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
3 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
4 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
5 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
6 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
8 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
9 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
10 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
11 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

12 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
13 PLANT DISEASES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
16 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
17 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys
18 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
19 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
20 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to

1 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, as follows:

3 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
4 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
5 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
6 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
7 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
8 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
9 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
10 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
11 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
12 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
13 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
14 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
15 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
16 investigations; $511,500.

17 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
18 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
19 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
20 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
21 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
22 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.

23 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re
24 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)

1 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
2 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
3 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
4 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
5 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
6 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

7 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
9 ing not exceed $381,700 for personal services in the District
10 of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the relative
11 utility and economy of agricultural products for food, cloth-
12 ing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions
13 of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of
14 such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
15 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
16 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
17 and for disseminating useful information on this subject,
18 $1,045,000.

19 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

20 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
21 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
22 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
23 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
24 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
25 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of

1 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
2 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
3 States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service
4 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
5 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
6 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
7 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
8 method development, and for operations conducted under
9 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to,
10 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
11 State and privately owned lands.

12 FOREST SERVICE

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
15 $1,055,378 for personal services in the District of Colum-
16 bia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to
17 the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act
18 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the
19 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-
20 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
21 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
22 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
23 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
24 be used for any experiment or test made outside
25 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of

1 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
2 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
3 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
4 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
5 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
6 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
7 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
8 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
9 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
10 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
11 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any
12 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
13 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
14 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
15 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
16 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
17 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
18 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil
19 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
20 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
21 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
22 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
23 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
24 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
25 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National

1 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
2 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
3 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
4 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
5 posters and related printed material, as follows:

6 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
7 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
8 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
9 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
10 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

11 National forest protection and management: For the
12 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
13 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
14 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
15 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
16 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
17 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
18 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to
19 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
20 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
21 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
22 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
23 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
24 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
25 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-

1 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
2 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
3 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
4 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
5 timber cultural operations; development and application
6 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
7 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
8 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
9 appraising of timber and other resources and development
10 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,
11 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
12 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
13 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
14 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
15 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
16 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
17 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
18 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or
19 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
20 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
21 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
22 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
23 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
24 $23,764,891, of whcih not to exceed $25,000 shall be
25 available for the purchase of one nursery site.

1 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
2 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
3 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
4 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
5 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
6 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

7 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
8 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
9 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
10 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
11 nance of improvements, as follows:

12 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
13 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
14 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
15 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
16 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
17 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
18 $2,475,000.

19 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
20 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
21 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,000,000, of which at least
22 $11,050 shall be expended for research in the utilization of
23 waste woods.

24 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest

1 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
2 under section 10, $572,000.

3 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

4 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
5 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
6 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
7 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
8 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
9 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
10 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

11 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

12 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
13 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
14 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
15 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
16 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
17 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
18 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
19 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and
20 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
21 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
22 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
23 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
24 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766),
25 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),

1 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
2 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
3 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
4 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
5 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
6 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
7 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
8 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
9 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

10 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

11 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
12 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
13 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $500,000, to be
14 available only for payment toward the purchase price of any
15 lands acquired.

16 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
17 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-
18 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
19 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
20 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
21 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
22 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
23 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
24 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
25 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;

1 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
2 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
3 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
4 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
5 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
6 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
7 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
8 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National
9 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
10 $35,000; in all $142,000.

11 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

12 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
13 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
14 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
15 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
16 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
17 Service administration, (1) $10,000,000 for forest develop-
18 ment roads and trails, and (2) $5,300,000 for forest high-
19 ways, which sums are authorized to be appropriated by
20 the Act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all,
21 $15,300,000 (including not to exceed $100,000 for per-
22 sonal services in the District of Columbia), to be imme-
23 diately available and to remain available until expended:
24 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
25 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings

1 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and
2 supplies used for road and trail construction and main-
3 tenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased,
4 altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not
5 exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building
6 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
7 $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year
8 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of
9 such building as certified by the Secretary.

10 FLOOD CONTROL

11 Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance
12 with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as
13 amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examina-
14 tions and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
15 $500,000, including personal services in the District of
16 Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain avail-
17 able until expended, with which shall be merged the un-
18 expended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or trans-
19 ferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided,*
20 That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of
21 lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds with-
22 out specific approval of the county board of supervisors of
23 the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided*
24 *further,* That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947
25 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds
26 shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Depart-

1 ment's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations
2 Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be
3 necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available
4 prior year balances.

5 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

6 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
7 the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
8 which provides for a national program of erosion control and
9 soil and water conservation, including not to exceed
10 $838,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
11 furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and main-
12 tenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or altera-
13 tion of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any
14 building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the
15 cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and
16 connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed
17 $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction
18 with land being purchased for other purposes and except for
19 eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed
20 $15,000 per building: *Provided further,* That no money
21 appropriated in this Act shall be available for the construc-
22 tion of any such building on land not owned by the Govern-
23 ment: *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where
24 the State has established a central State agency authorized
25 to enter into agreements with the United States or any of
26 its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving

1 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
2 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
3 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
4 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
5 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
6 as follows:

7 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
8 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
9 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and
10 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
11 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
12 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
13 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all
14 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
15 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
16 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for con-
17 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental water-
18 sheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $673,000.

19 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
20 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
21 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
22 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
23 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation
24 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
25 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
26 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation

1 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
2 in demonstration projects.

3 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
4 SUBMARGINAL LAND

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
6 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
7 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions
8 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
9 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
10 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

11 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
12 ADMINISTRATION

13 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
14 RESOURCES

15 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
16 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive,
17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-
18 proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–
19 590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment
20 Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except
21 the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and
22 the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-
23 ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for
24 the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-
25 plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the
26 United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until De-

1 cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said
2 provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as
3 amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,
4 during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,
5 inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000,000 of
6 the total sum provided under this head shall be available
7 during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-
8 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but
9 not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the ap-
10 propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,
11 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*
12 That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the
13 certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such
14 form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out
15 the conservation practice or practices and has complied with
16 all other requirements as conditions for such payments and
17 that the statements and information contained in the applica-
18 tion for payment are correct and true, to the best of his
19 knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March
20 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further,*
21 That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available
22 for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment
23 Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of
24 February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or
25 expenses of any regional information employees or any
26 State or county information employees, but this shall not

1 preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-
2 tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds
3 shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses
4 in connection with the formulation or administration of any
5 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-
6 conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,
7 as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment
8 Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-
9 ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the
10 Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer
11 to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-
12 sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing
13 payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such
14 amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
15 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
16 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
17 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
18 practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program
19 under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*
20 *further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make
21 payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-
22 ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated
23 pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-
24 tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-
25 tary determines that, because of induction into the armed
26 forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were

1 prevented from filing, applications for payment under any
2 such program during the period the applicable appropri-
3 ation for such program was available for obligation,
4 such payments to be made out of the unobligated
5 balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use
6 of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of
7 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*
8 That an application for payment on the prescribed form is
9 filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in
10 case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer
11 under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the
12 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7
13 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the
14 date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December
15 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That
16 no part of any funds available to the Department, or
17 any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting
18 a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal
19 year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any
20 person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled
21 "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved
22 August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in
23 accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of
24 July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or
25 attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of
26 Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services

1 or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a
2 Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or
3 appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-
4 ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*
5 *further,* That where farmer participation in the program
6 in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full
7 amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or
8 sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to
9 States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have
10 not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

11 SUGAR ACT

12 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
14 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
15 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of
16 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
17 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)
18 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
19 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

20 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

21 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions
22 of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public
23 Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this
24 appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources
25 within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

1 ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING
2 AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

3 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
4 administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
5 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including
6 personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

7 MARKETING SERVICES

8 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $2,-
9 211,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in
10 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
11 as follows:

12 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
13 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
14 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
15 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
16 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
17 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their
18 products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other
19 agricultural products, $1,520,000.

20 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
21 tions and certification in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
22 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
23 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,
24 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
25 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when

1 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
2 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
3 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
4 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
5 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
6 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
7 service rendered, $712,000.

8 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
9 among the people of the United States useful information
10 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
11 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
12 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
13 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
14 ards of classification of American farm and food products
15 throughout the world for making analyses of cotton fiber as
16 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
17 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
18 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
19 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
20 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
21 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
22 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
23 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and
24 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
25 diem of persons serving without compensation while away

1 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
2 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
3 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make avail-
4 able to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department
5 such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary
6 to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is
7 made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts
8 transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation
9 items in this Act.

10 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
11 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
12 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
13 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
14 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection
15 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
16 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
17 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
18 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
19 $1,552,000.

20 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
21 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
22 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
23 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–
24 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
25 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.

1 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
2 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
3 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
4 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
5 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

6 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
7 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
8 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
9 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
10 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
11 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
12 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
13 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-
14 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
15 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

16 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
17 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
18 $1,128,000.

19 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
20 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

21 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
22 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
23 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation
24 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
25 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved

1 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
2 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
3 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
4 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
5 Congress.

6 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
7 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
8 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
9 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

10 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
11 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
12 91–99), $41,000.

13 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
14 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
15 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-
16 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
17 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
18 therein, $293,500.

19 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
20 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
21 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
22 $138,000.

23 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

24 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
25 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity

1 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
2 not to exceed $141,000 for personal services in the District
3 of Columbia, $530,000.

4 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

5 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
6 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
7 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
8 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
9 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
10 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
11 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

12 Loans: For loans under title II, $60,000,000.

13 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the
14 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
15 $1,000,000.

16 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
17 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
18 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
19 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
20 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
21 $18,000,00.

22 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
23 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
24 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-

1 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
2 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
3 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
4 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
5 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
6 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
7 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
8 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
9 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
10 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
11 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-
12 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
13 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security
14 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
15 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
16 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
17 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
18 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
19 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
20 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
21 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary
22 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
23 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
24 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
25 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of

1 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
2 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
3 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
4 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
5 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
6 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
7 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
8 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
9 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
10 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
11 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

12 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
13 AREAS

14 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
15 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
16 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
17 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
18 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
19 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
20 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

21 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

22 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
23 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
24 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

25 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-

1 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
2 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
3 financial and credit reports, $4,000,000.

4 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
5 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
6 7 thereof, $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary
7 of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section
8 3 (a) of said Act.

9 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act
10 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
11 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

12 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
13 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
14 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
15 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
16 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
17 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
18 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
19 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
20 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may
21 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
22 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
23 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
24 Electrification Administration established by Executive
25 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid

1 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
2 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
3 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
4 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
5 foregoing provision: *Provided,* That such obligations in-
6 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
7 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
8 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
9 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity
10 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
11 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of
12 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
13 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
14 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
15 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
16 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
17 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
18 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
19 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
20 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the
21 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
22 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
23 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
24 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
25 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the

1 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
2 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
3 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
4 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
5 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
6 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
7 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
8 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
9 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions
10 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
11 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-
12 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
13 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
14 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
15 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
16 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
17 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
18 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
19 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is
20 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
21 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
22 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
23 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
24 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
25 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For

1 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
2 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
3 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
4 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
5 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
6 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
7 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
8 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
9 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

10 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
11 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall
12 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
13 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
14 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
15 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
16 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
17 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

18 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses including personal services in
21 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
22 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
23 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
24 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
25 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-

1 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
2 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
3 lower price than to others, payment for which may
4 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
5 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
6 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
7 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
8 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
9 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per
10 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
11 from their homes, without other compensation from the
12 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
13 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
14 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
15 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
16 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
17 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act
18 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
19 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
20 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
21 organizations as provided in said section.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
24 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
25 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,

1 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
2 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
3 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
4 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
5 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
6 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
7 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
8 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
9 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary
10 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
11 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-
12 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
13 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
14 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
15 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
16 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
17 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal
18 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
19 association serving the area.

20 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
21 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
22 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
23 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
24 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
25 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-

1 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
2 Department for which appropriations are made under such
3 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
4 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
5 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
6 Budget.

7 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
8 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
9 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
10 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
11 gency of persons in the field service of the Department
12 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
13 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
14 tural Relations.

15 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
16 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
17 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

18 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
19 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
20 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
21 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
22 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
23 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

24 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
25 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any

1 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
2 the United States or who is a member of an organization
3 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
4 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
5 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
6 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
7 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
8 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
9 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
10 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
11 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
12 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
13 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
14 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
15 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
16 Government of the United States by force or violence:
17 *Provided further,* That such administrative or supervisory
18 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
19 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
20 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
21 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
22 *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a
23 strike against the Government of the United States or who
24 is a member of an organization of Government employees
25 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of

1 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
2 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
3 Government of the United States by force or violence
4 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
5 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
6 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
7 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
8 more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the
9 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
10 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
11 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be con-
12 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
13 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
14 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
15 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
16 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
17 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
18 templated by this section.

19 SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Department of
20 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

21 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

22 SEC. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
23 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
24 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
25 year, namely:

1 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
2 expenses, $1,000,000, including not to exceed $700 for
3 newspapers.

4 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
5 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
6 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop
7 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
8 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
9 $10,000,000.

10 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
11 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
12 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
13 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
14 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
15 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation
16 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
17 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
18 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

19 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
20 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
21 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
22 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
23 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
24 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
25 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for

1 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
2 (including legal and special services performed on a contract
3 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
4 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
5 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property
6 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
7 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
8 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
9 hereof.

10 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
11 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
12 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
13 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
14 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of
15 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
16 cotton, and flax.

17 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
18 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-
19 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
20 plicable to title II of this Act.

21 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

22 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF
23 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

24 The funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by
25 section 32, as amended, of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7

1 U. S. C. 612 (c)), are hereby rescinded effective July 1,
2 1947, and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered
3 into the Treasury immediately thereafter.

# INDEX


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of | 34 |
| Agricultural Economics, Bureau of | 11 |
| Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, Administration of | 53 |
| Agricultural Research Administration | 15 |
| Alaska, research on agricultural problems of | 18 |
| Animal Industry, Bureau of | 21 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation | 70 |
| Commodity Exchange Authority | 57 |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | 48 |
| Dairy Industry, Bureau of | 27 |
| Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of | 30 |
| Experiment Stations, Office of | 19 |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (Section 32 funds) | 71 |
| Extension Service | 13 |
| Farm Credit Administration | 64 |
| Farmers' Home Administration | 58 |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | 69 |
| Flood control | 45 |
| Foreign Agricultural Relations, Office of | 12 |
| Forest roads and trails | 44 |
| Forest Service | 37 |
| General provisions | 65 |
| Government corporations | 69 |
| Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Bureau of | 36 |
| Information, Office of | 7 |
| International Production Control Committees | 13 |
| Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land | 48 |
| Library | 10 |
| Marketing services | 53 |
| Penalty mail | 4 |
| Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, Bureau of | 27 |
| Printing and binding | 9 |
| Production and Marketing Administration | 48 |
| Reduction in appropriation | 71 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | 4 |
| Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials | 17 |
| Rural Electrification Administration | 60 |
| School Lunch Act | 52 |
| Secretary of Agriculture, Office of | 2 |
| Soil Conservation Service | 46 |
| Solicitor, Office of | 6 |
| Special research fund, Department of Agriculture | 16 |
| Submarginal land, retirement of | 48 |
| Sugar Act | 52 |
| Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas | 60 |
| White pine blister rust control | 36 |

Union Calendar No. 216

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. 450]

# A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DIRKSEN

MAY 23, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST OF
# CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 27, 1947
For actions of May 26, 1947
80th-1st, No. 99

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,6,20,23
Crop insurance.....21
Education.....18
Federal aid..... 8
Fertilizers.....10
Housing.....3,13
Information.....15
Insect control..... 5
Labor.....20
Lands.....7,9
Lands, grant.....14
Lands, reclamation.....19
Loans, farm.....12
Marketing..... 5
Organization, executive.25
Personnel..... 2
Roads..... 8
Sugar.....16
Taxation.....11
Trade, foreign.....17,22
Wool.....4,17

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported rule waiving points of order on agricultural appropriation bill. Rep. Gamble introduced bill to end sugar rationing for home consumption. House committee reported bill continuing retirement benefits for separated employees. Senate conferees appointed on wool bill. Senate committee reported bill to regulate marketing of insecticides, rodenticides, weed killers, etc. Senate committee reported Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. The House Committee made a general reduction in the Budget estimate for LAND UTILIZATION PROJECTS of $1,660,000 instead of eliminating increases for reconstruction and repair of dams and spillways as reported in Digest 98. The Rules Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 218, which provides "That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601)making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived" (H. Rept. 463) (pp. 5954, 5963). The Daily Digest says this bill will be considered today(p. D295).

2. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3511, which extends until June 30, 1948, the period during which annuities are provided for separated employees at least 55 years of age and who have served at least 25 years (H. Rept. 461)(p. 5963).

3. HOUSING. Received from the Hawaii Legislature a memorial favoring S. 866, the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill (p. 5964).

SENATE

4. WOOL. Sens. Aiken, Bushfield, Young, Thomas (Okla.), and Ellender were appointed conferees on S. 814, the wool price-support bill (pp. 5928-9). The amendments agreed to in the House are printed in the Congressional Record on the pages noted above. House conferees not yet appointed.

5. MARKETING. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H.R. 1237, to regulate the marketing of insecticides, rodenticides, weed killers, pest-control devices, etc. (S.Rept. 199)(p. 5926).

6. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H.R. 2436 (S.Rept. 201) (p. 5926).

7. GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment S.1262,

to establish a Board on Geographic Names, on which the Department would be represented, to function conjointly with the Secretary of Interior in standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in the Federal Government (S.Rept. 205) (p. 5926).

8. HIGHWAYS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H.R. 1874, to provide that funds apportioned to States under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 shall remain available for 2 years after they are authorized (S.Rept. 200) (p. 5926).

9. LANDS. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment S. 1185, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to dispose of sand, stone, gravel, and timber or other forest products on U.S. public lands if the disposal is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, prohibited by law, and would not be detrimental to the public interest. National forest lands would not come under this jurisdiction and where lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Interior Department or of a State, Territory, etc., disposal would be made only with approval of such Federal department or other agency (S.Rept. 204) (p. 5926).

10. FERTILIZERS. Received from the Kansas Farm Bureau a telegram favoring S. 1251, the national fertilizer-policy bill (p. 5926).

11. TAXATION. Continued debate on H.R. 1, the individual income tax-reduction bill (pp. 5929-52).

12. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee is expected to act on May 28 on S. 925, to transfer the Land Bank Commissioner loan service to the Federal Land Bank System (p. D294).

13. HOUSING. Received a Hawaii Legislature resolution favoring S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill (p. 5925).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. GRANT LANDS. S. 1348, by Sen. Cordon, Oreg., to provide for the addition of certain revested Oreg. and Calif. railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oreg. To Public Lands Committee. (p.5927.)

15. INFORMATION. S.Con.Res. 16, by Sen. Hatch, N.Mex., to establish a joint committee to investigate Government information programs. To Foreign Relations Committee. (p. 5927.) Remarks of author.

16. SUGAR RATIONING. H.R. 3612, by Rep. Gamble, N.Y., to amend the Sugar Control Extension Act so as to terminate the authority to allocate or ration refined sugar among users for home consumption. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 5963.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

17. WOOL. Speech in the House by Rep. Crawford, Mich., opposing reciprocal trade agreements with respect to wool (pp. A2606-7).

18. EDUCATION. Sen. Sparkman, Ala., inserted his recent address on Federal aid to education (pp. A2609-11).

19. RECLAMATION. Sen. Magnuson, Wash., inserted his statement before the Appropriations Committee urging restoration of reclamation funds in the Interior Appro-

80th Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
1st Session } { No. 463

# CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 3601

May 26, 1947.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. Allen of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 218]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 218, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

O

House Calendar No. 89

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 218

[Report No. 463]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 26, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

# RESOLUTION

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

House Calendar No. 89

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 218

[Report No. 463]

# RESOLUTION

Waiving points of order against H. R. 3601, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

MAY 26, 1947

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT

*Cutter, Freeman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Davis, Edwin C.

ENSIGNS

Anderson, Richard B.
Barr, Robert M., Jr.
Berglund, Eugene N., Jr.
Berude, John B.
Berwanger, George E.
Bowers, Richard L.
Coggins, Carl R.
Cole, Floyd C.
Coughlan, Robert E., Jr.
Dickey, Robert M.
*Forshee, Francis L.
Jefferson, James E.
Johnson, Paul
Karsten, Robert H.
Kern, William A.
Matson, George L.
Murray, Harrison C.
Natke, Ernest
Oellrich, Ernest H.
Owens, John D.
Pearson, Jack B.
Pressell, Harry W.
Root, William F.
Schwartz, Israel L.
Senkow, Joseph
Stone, Warren I.
Taylor, David J.
Timidaiski, James T.
Trekell, William V.
Williams, David, Jr.

The following-named officer to the grade and rank indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Abelson, Sol M.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Anderson, Allan N.
Bruening, Paul M.
Buchner, Keith "C"
Calcagno, Peter
Chupelio, Anthony F.
Clepp, Joseph M.
Darrow, Edward E.
Dixon, Grover C.
Fisher, Albert B., Jr.
Fox, Gilbert J.
Goldstein, Gerald H.
Goodfellow, James P.
Greene, James R.
Hamel, Carlton E.
Hamill, William T., Jr.
Hanson, Frank L.
Howard, Joseph E.
Jones, Joseph R.
Kiraly, Joseph L.
Knipple, John D.
Kuhlman, Norman H. C.
McKeown, Thomas P.
Murison, Richard K.
Nash, William T.
Peck, LaVern E.
Petro, John G.
Selekman, Milton H.
Smith, James H.
Thompson, Charles E.
Thompson, William A., Jr.
Urban, Donald A.
Whitchurch, Frank H.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mitter, Wayne S.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER IN THE NAVY WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Irwin, James D., Jr.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF GUNNER

Bixby, Norman W.

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

Smith, Wilbur E.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Early, Justin H.
Gospodarich, John
Hamilton, Robert E.
Jones, Samuel L.
Lackey, Karl C.
Mayabb, Virgil M.
McCray, James G.
Wilson, Charles M.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Farmer, William H.
Stillwell, Louis "C"

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERK

Perry, William B.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHER

Monical, Russell W.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHER

Brown, Eduardo F.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Barrett, Howard A.
Beatson, David C.
Bohannan, Ray
Cook, George W.
Glines, Rankin S.
Shepherd, Joe W.

# House of Representatives

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPEAKER'S ROOM,
*May 26, 1947.*

I hereby designate CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
*Speaker.*

PRAYER

Rev. C. Dale David Doren, pastor, Grace Episcopal Church, Huron, S. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom, whose statutes are good and gracious and whose law is truth, we beseech Thee most humbly to direct and prosper the works and labors of these Thy servants here assembled. Dispose their hearts to the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people, that all things may be so ordered and settled by their honest endeavors upon the best and surest foundations; that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us all for generations.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government.

All which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 23, 1947, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a resolution (H. Res. 218) from the Committee on Rules making in order the bill H. R. 3601.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The resolution follows:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 236. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals;

H. R. 384. An act for the relief of W. H. Baker and Walter Baker;

H. R. 428. An act for the relief of Charles N. Bemis;

H. R. 444. An act for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased;

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of the estate of Nellie P. Dunn, deceased;

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3245. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED BRADLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to announce to the House the sudden passing of the distinguished Representative of the Eleventh Michigan District, the Honorable FRED BRADLEY. He departed this life on Saturday last while on an official visit to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

This colleague was first elected in 1938 and has served continuously since. Members of this House have been increasingly impressed with his alertness, with his capacity for hard, intelligent, patriotic work, with his determination to do his full duty as he saw it, and with the splendid courage with which he always met the many controversial problems which confronted him. There has been no Member of this House, during my long years here, whose service has impressed me more favorably than his. I deeply regret the passing of this friend.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague brings to each and every one of us not only grief at the severing of associations, but a somber pondering on the meaning of this enigma of human existence. The mortal sense of life would make of man little more than the grass of the fields, flourishing for a brief season and then withering away. Compared to eternity, the human span is but a twinkling. We are apt to forget that billions of individuals have come and gone; the millions who are now living will, in no great stretch of time, join the silent majority. When we stop to realize by what a narrow margin we cling to that which we call life, we wonder not that some of our colleagues have gone from us, but that more have not gone.

Every tenet of religious faith, every tenet of philosophy, every tenet of logic, every tenet of human hope bids us to be of good cheer, because our colleagues, having passed beyond our ken, are not forever blotted out, but live on and work on.

None can explain the mystery of death. We can hope. None can reason how or why our colleagues should have been called, except that that is the way of flesh. But there is vast consolation, Mr. Speaker, in the hope and the faith that our colleagues, somewhere, in some happier realm, labor on, rising ever upward in their striving to attain truth.

So, instead of grieving as our stricken colleagues depart, we can find it in our hearts to be grateful to infinite being that we were permitted to know them, to be associated with them, to work with them, and to cherish their memories as we hope those left behind when we go will cherish memories of us.

That great philosopher, that kindly gentleman, that able Justice of the Supreme Court, the late Oliver Wendell Holmes, once put into words the hope and the faith that I would voice to you here today. Said he:

> I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it has never seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace.

It seems to be, Mr. Speaker, the common fate of kings and beggars, of just and unjust, of saint and sinner, that each of us shall sometime embark upon that journey from earth to the far yonder shores of an unknown eternity.

So it has been with the colleague and my devoted friend of whom we speak today. May his soul rest in peace to the end of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a long-distance call has been received by one of our colleagues, a member of the Michigan delegation. Congressman FRED BRADLEY, of Rogers City, Mich., left this world last Saturday on a journey from which no traveler returns.

In his desire to serve his country, which he loved devotedly, he contributed every talent he possessed. He symbolized unselfish devotion to duty and responsibility as a legislator and public servant.

Congress has been deprived of the judgment and ability of a great American and an able legislator; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we, the Michigan congressional delegation in the Eightieth Congress, do by this means express our deep regret that his career has been brought to a close at a time when his highest ambitions and ideals were being realized; and be it further

*Resolved*, That, while we feel the ineffectiveness of any act of ours to in any way assuage the grief of his widow, we extend to her our deepest sympathy in this her hour of bereavement.

ROY O. WOODRUFF, EARL C. MICHENER, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, GEORGE A. DONDERO, FRED L. CRAWFORD, ALBERT J. ENGEL, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, PAUL W. SHAFER, WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, BARTEL J. JONKMAN, JOHN B. BENNETT, HOWARD A. COFFIN, HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, JOHN D. DINGELL, JOHN LESINSKI, GEORGE G. SADOWSKI.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 217), which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 217

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

*Resolved*, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. HOFFMAN, SHAFER, GRANT of Indiana, and DINGELL.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

710. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

711. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Articles for the Government of the Navy to improve the administration of naval justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 468. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3309. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Washington: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the official reporters of debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1945. A bill to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1946. A bill to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1947. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3511. A bill to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 218. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 3601, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VORYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organizatiton and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3611. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3612. A bill to amend the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 so as to terminate the authority to allocate or ration refined sugar among users for home consumption; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3613. A bill to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3614. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3615. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1946, entitled "An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3616. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3617. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., and 2 miles west from said bridge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3618. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 3619. A bill relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3620. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons who served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending pension benefits to persons who served on certain transport vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal operation of air-traffic control towers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

in relation to providing funds for a continued Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199, granting tax exemptions to those held prisoners by the Japanese; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, S. 866, of the Eightieth Congress, first session; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of Flavia Isidora Vieira Sauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

568. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 163 citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

569. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution 37 of the California State Legislature, relative to extending pension benefits to persons who served on certain transport vessels operated by the Army during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

570. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bar Association of Arkansas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for an amendment to the Federal Employers' Liability Act; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

571. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 1, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

572. Also, petition of the membership of the Pensacola Townsend Club, No. 1, Pensacola, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

573. Also, petition of American Veterans Committee, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to restrictions imposed on American citizens of oriental birth who wish to travel from Hawaii to the mainland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

574. Also, petition of Holy Name Society of the Sacred Heart Church, of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to subversive activities of foreign agents who tend to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

575. Also, petition of the New England Conference of the Methodist Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming support of the provision in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which forbids the use of public funds for the maintenance of private and sectarian schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DIGEST OF
# CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 28, 1947
For actions of May 27, 1947
80th-1st, No. 100

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill,1948 (individual items not indexed)..... 1
Appropriations.....1,19
Archives.....15
Claims.....22
Crop insurance..... 2
Fisheries.....14
Food, administration..... 4
Foreign affairs.....17
Grain.....17
Housing.....7,10
Labor, farm.....18
Lands.....6,13
Lands, grant.....14
Lands, reclamation.....11
Organization, executive...10
Personnel.....3,5,9
Potatoes.....16
Property, surplus.....12
Remount service..... 3
Soil conservation.....19
Taxation..... 8
Textiles.....21
Trade, foreign.....3,20
Veterans' benefits..... 5
Wool.....20

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated agricultural appropriation bill. House committee reported bill to place crop insurance on experimental basis. House committee ordered reported bills to extend Export-Control Act and to transfer Remount Service to USDA. Rep. Reed criticized Government's foreign food shipments as a cause of feed shortage. Reps. Poage and Grant discussed potato problem, explaining efforts which have been made to dispose of surplus.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Began and completed general debate on this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 6021-62). The bill is to be read for amendment today.

Agreed, 189-170, to a resolution waiving points of order on the bill (pp. 6021-9). Reps. Chenoweth, Halleck, and Dirksen spoke in favor of the rule; Reps. Sabath, McCormack, Hope, Andresen, Clark, Whitten, and Cooley spoke against it. Rep. Sabath inserted a Farm Bureau telegram stating it is "deeply shocked" at several recommendations of the Appropriations Committee (p. 6023).

Rep. Plumley, Vt., said he disagreed with "the general proposition in this bill, insofar as it would follow the New Deal program" (p. 6030). Rep. Andersen, Minn., spoke in favor of economy, said "We will give REA every dime they need, but...we do not intend to put more money on the shelf than is necessary," stated that soil-conservation payments are not necessary to insure soil conservation, objected to the proposed decreases in PMA county-committee funds, recommended a $561,000 cut in Solicitor's Office and a 20% cut in Office of the Secretary, and stated that "too much of the economy in this bill is at the expense of others than the employees" (pp. 6030-3). Rep. Hays, Ark., asked for restoration of FHA funds (pp. 6033-4). Rep. Winstead, Miss., said the ACP item would break a "commitment" to farmers, although recommending a gradual tapering off of the program, said the bill would keep the "high-priced administrative... personnel" and apply the cuts to local levels "which actually render the service," objected to the REA reductions and rescission of Sec. 32 funds, and criticized FHA cuts and failure to include the full Research and Marketing Act authorization (pp. 6034-5). Rep. Allen, La., opposed SCS, ACP, and Sec. 32 cuts (pp. 6035-7). Rep. Davis, Ga., spoke in favor of economy but objected to soil-conservation and school-lunch reductions (pp. 6037-8). Rep. Phillips spoke in support of the FHA, ACP, Sec. 32, and OFAR cuts (pp. 6038-40). Rep. Church, Ill., spoke in favor of economy and commended the bill (pp. 6040-1). Rep.

Price, Ill., objected to REA and SCS reductions (pp. 6041-2). Rep. Rankin, Miss., opposed REA cuts (p. 6018). Rep. Worley, Tex., spoke against reductio in ACP, SCS, FHA, and REA (pp. 6042-4). Rep. Ellsworth, Oreg., criticized FS cuts (pp. 6044-5). Rep. Whitten, Miss., objected to the procedures by which the bill was considered in committee and criticized cuts in REA, SCS, Sec. 32, Research and Marketing Act, and FHA (pp. 6045-51). Rep. Hope, Kans., inserted a letter from Under Secretary Dodd on the effect of rescinding Sec. 32 money and defended this program (pp. 6051-3). Rep. Zimmerman, Mo., objected to Sec. 32 and soil-conservation cuts (pp. 6053-4). Rep. Brown, Ga., spoke against reductions in SCS, ACP, Sec. 32, and FHA (pp. 6054-5). Rep. Evins, Tenn., spoke against the proposed cuts in general (p. 6055). Rep. McMillan, S. C., objected to the meat-inspection reimbursement provision and cuts in REA, ACP, and FHA (pp. 6055-6). Rep. Williams, Miss., criticized reductions in REA, soil-conservation, and Sec. 32 (p. 6056). Rep. Mansfield, Mont., congratulated the committee on recognizing the importance of forestry but objecte to FS cuts (pp. 6056-7). Rep. Cannon, Mo., criticized reductions in Research and Marketing Act, ACP, SCS, REA, and FHA (pp. 6057-9). Rep. Poage, Tex., sai the bill "grabs out the support under surpluses" (pp. 6059-61). Rep. Beckworth, Tex., said he hoped the bill would be amended to prevent a set-back in the farm program and urged REA expansion (p. 6061). Rep. Robertson, Ill., objected to ACP, REA, Research and Marketing Act, Sec. 32; but agreed with the committee's treatment of Extension and SCS items (pp. 6061-2).

Rep. Dirksen said, "I hope we can complete the bill tomorrow" (p. 6029). Majority Leader Halleck said D. C. legislation is to be considered Thurs. "if the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is theretofore disposed of. Of course our first task is to dispose of the appropriation bill," and that "there will be no session Friday" (p. 6021). The House is to meet today at 10:00 a. m. (p. 6062).

2. CROP INSURANCE. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 3465, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to place crop insurance on an experimental basis (H.Rept. 470) (p. 6063).

3. EXPORT-CONTROLS; REMOUNT SERVICE; PERSONNEL. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported* H.R. 3049, extension of the Export-Control Act; H.R. 3484, transfer of Remount Service to USDA; and H.R. 1845, military leave for Federal employees who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps (p. D302).

* Copies of the bills and reports will not be available until the bills ar actually reported, when this Digest will include a statement to that effect.

4. FOOD DESTRUCTION. Rep. Murray, Wis., inserted and discussed his bill, H.R.3585 to prohibit destruction of foods and fibers (p. 6020).

5. VETERANS' PREFERENCE. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported wit amendment H.R. 1389, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act so as to require ac tive full-time paid duty in the armed forces and separation under honorable conditions for elegibility for benefits (H.Rept. 465) (p. 6063).

6. LANDS. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment H.R. 2852, provid ing for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, Ky. (H.Rept. 469) (p. 6063).

7. HOUSING. Received a Chicago, Ill., resolution urging prompt action on the Taft Wagner-Ellender housing bill (p. 6064).

SENATE

8. TAXATION. Continued debate on H.R. 1, the individual income tax-reduction bill, agreeing to the Committee amendments (pp. 5970-6015).

9. PERSONNEL. Received a report on Federal personnel for Apr. and Mar. 1947 from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures (pp. 5966-7).

1. REORGANIZATION; HOUSING. Both Houses received the President's Reorganization Plan 3 which provides for the grouping of "nearly all of the permanent housing agencies and functions of the Government, and the remaining emergency housing activities, in a Housing and Home Finance Agency with the following constituent operating agencies: (a) A Home Loan Bank Board to administer the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its members; (b) a Federal Housing Administration with the same functions now provided by law for that agency; and (c) a Public Housing Administration to take over the functions of the United States Housing Authority and certain remaining emergency housing activities pending the completion of their liquidation." (H.Doc. 270) (pp. D. 299, 5968, 6018-9).

1. IRRIGATION. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment S. 753, to authorize Interior Department to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project (S.Rept. 206) (p. 5966).

BILLS INTRODUCED

1. SURPLUS PROPERTY. S. 1353, by Sen. Aiken, Vt., to amend the Surplus Property Act with reference to condemnation powers of the Administrator. To Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee. (p. 5968.)

1. LANDS. H.R. 3628, by Rep. Welch, Calif., to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 6063.)

1. FISHERIES. H.R. 3637, by Rep. Phillips, Calif., granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission. To Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. (p. 6063.)

1. ARCHIVES. H.R. 3638, by Rep. Rees, Kans., to amend Sec. 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the U.S. Government. To Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (p. 6063.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

1. POTATO SURPLUS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Poage, Tex., discussing the potato situation, explaining the efforts which have been made to dispose of the surplus, and justifying the price-support program (pp. A2627-8).

Extension of remarks of Rep. Grant, Ala., discussing the potato-surplus problem, with particular reference to the situation in Alabama (pp. A2643-4).

1. FEED SHORTAGE; FOREIGN FOOD SHIPMENTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Reed, N.Y., criticizing the Government's foreign food shipments as a cause of the food shortage (pp. A2628-9).

1. FARM LABOR. Rep. Horan, Mich., inserted a memorandum pointing out the effects of the two different definitions of agricultural labor contained in the House

and Senate versions of the labor-management bills (p. A2633).

19. APPROPRIATIONS; SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Dorn, S.C., inserted a Farm Bureau letter protesting against cuts in the agricultural conservation program funds (p. 2635).

Extension of remarks of Rep. Morrison, La., protesting against cuts in funds for the agricultural conservation program (pp. A2653-4).

20. WOOL; FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. McCormack, Mass., inserted a Washington Post article, "Wool Tariff Versus Foreign Trade"(pp. A2645-6).

21. TEXTILES. Rep. Canfield, N.J., inserted a letter from John C. Hazen, National Retail Dry Goods Assoc., favoring legislation to control the production of dangerous flammable textiles (p. A2646).

22. CLAIMS. Rep. Gearhart, Calif., inserted Harold Aron's article, "Federal Tort Claims Act; Comments and Questions for Practicing Lawyers" (pp. A2649-50).

- o -

COMMITTEE-HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for May 28: S. Foreign Relations, St. Lawrence waterway; S. Labor and Public Welfare, Taft health bill; S. Judiciary, Export-Control Act extension; S. Expenditures in the Executive Departments; technical information and service; S. Agriculture, fertilizer bill; S. Public Works, water-pollution bill; S. Small Business, steel hearings; S. Public Lands, Reclamation Act amendments; S. Appropriations; Interior appropriations bill; H. Appropriations, legislative and War civil functions appropriation bills (ex.); H. Education and Labor, Federal aid to education; H. Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Government publicity and propaganda; H. Post Office and Civil Service, censuses of manufactures (Stein and Been to testify); H. Rules, Export-Import Bank; H. Newsprint and Paper Supply (McArdle to testify).

- o -

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 113 Adm. Arrangements may be made to be kept advised, routinely, of developments on any particular bill.

- oOo -

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 218

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 26, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

MAY 27, 1947

Considered and agreed to

# RESOLUTION

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 218

## RESOLUTION

Waiving points of order against H. R. 3601, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

MAY 26, 1947

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

MAY 27, 1947

Considered and agreed to

PROGRAM FOR THE REST OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the request just granted indicates, it now will be in order to consider bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia on Thursday of this week if the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is theretofore disposed of. Of course our first task is to dispose of the appropriation bill. It is my hope that the debate on the bill may proceed for such time as is necessary this afternoon and that we then begin to read the bill for amendment. If there is indication that we cannot finish that bill tomorrow evening, coming in at 12 o'clock tomorrow, it is my idea that we come in at an earlier hour tomorrow in the hope that the appropriation bill can be disposed of tomorrow. It is my hope then that we take up on Thursday the two investigatory resolutions that have been programed for that day and in addition take care of some matters from the Committee on the District of Columbia which I understand are quite important but not particularly controversial.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As the gentleman knows, Memorial Day comes on Friday. A good many of the Members, including myself, have made engagements with the understanding, of course, that the Agricultural appropriation bill would be concluded by tomorrow night. Unfortunately, the death of a very good colleague changed the program, which is the reason I ask if there is a possibility that final action on this bill may be deferred until next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure the gentleman would discover in the remarks I have made a recognition of the very situation about which he is speaking. I have announced that there will be no session Friday. It is hoped that we can go over from Thursday to Monday, in view of the fact that many Members have personal obligations and commitments and matters that they want to take care of over Memorial Day, as do people generally in the country. I can see no reason why we cannot carry out the program I have outlined and in that way dispose of this very important measure that is before us by tomorrow night and likewise dispose of other important matters on Thursday, matters necessary to be considered and about which there is urgency but as to which individually there might not be too much interest as far as the Members are concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much general debate will we have on this appropriation bill?

Mr. HALLECK. No agreement has been reached on that. That is up to the members of the Committee on Appropriations having the matter in charge. I have spoken to some of them about it. As I understand, it is expected that the general debate will proceed today, and I take it that opportunity will be given to anyone who wants to make a statement in respect to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I am merely trying to find out whether general debate is to be concluded this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. I would say by all means it should be concluded this afternoon. As I said, I trust that not only can general debate be concluded but also that the reading of the bill may begin because, as the gentleman well knows, it is when the bill is being read that we generally find the greatest desire for time to speak.

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I am concerned, I would be willing to start reading it in the beginning and debate the various amendments as we go along.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews, N. Y. | Hébert | Norrell |
| Auchincloss | Heffernan | Peterson |
| Bender | Jenkins, Pa. | Pfeifer |
| Bennett, Mich. | Keefe | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Bland | Kennedy | Ploeser |
| Boggs, La. | Kilburn | Powell |
| Byrne, N. Y. | King | Rabin |
| Cannon | Klein | Rayfiel |
| Chelf | Knutson | Redden |
| Clements | Lane | Reeves |
| Colmer | Lanham | Riley |
| Cox | Lea | Rooney |
| Curtis | Lynch | Sadowski |
| Davis, Wis. | McConnell | Sarbacher |
| Dawson, Ill. | McDowell | Scoblick |
| Dingell | McGarvey | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Domengeaux | Macy | Shafer |
| Eberharter | Madden | Smathers |
| Fuller | Maloney | Somers |
| Gallagher | Mansfield, Tex. | Teague |
| Gary | Marcantonio | Weichel |
| Gifford | Merrow | West |
| Gwinn, N. Y. | Mitchell | Youngblood |
| Hand | Morrison | |
| Harness, Ind. | Nixon | |
| Hart | Nodar | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address recently made by him.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a speech.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include an article.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some editorials.

Mr. DORN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the late Honorable Fred Bradley, of Michigan.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made in Chicago last Sunday.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

(Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order which might be made against the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, H. R. 3601, which is on the calendar for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is made necessary because of certain provisions contained in this appropriation bill which are subject to points of order. It is points of order will be made unless this rule is adopted. There is opposition to the rule because of a clash over jurisdiction between two very important and powerful committees of this House, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to include in the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture several sections which may be considered legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore subject to points of order. I do not know that all of these items are controversial, but the Committee on Agriculture feels that the bill contains legislation over which it has jurisdiction and is opposed to this rule waiving points of order. The Committee on Appropriations defends itself by stating that these are items which relate to appropriations and the allocation of funds. The committee concedes that several sections of the bill are subject to points of order. However, in line with precedents established in previous years, the Appropriations Committee asked for this rule. I might state that it has been customary to adopt similar rules on these annual agricultural appropriation bills, so there is nothing new in this procedure.

I will not take the time to discuss these items which are subject of this controversy. That will be done by members of the Committee on Agriculture and the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman that as the membership generally knows, I served on the Rules Committee for a number of years under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. No one has been more conscientious than I have been in trying to protect the prerogatives, the responsibilities, and the powers of the legislative committees. However, as the gentleman has pointed out, we very frequently found it desirable to report from the Rules Committee, rules such as this, in order that matters necessary to be taken care of could be taken care of. So certainly, as the gentleman has said, this proposition is nothing new. It follows many, many precedents that have been established. As I understand it, on this particular occasion, it undertakes to deal with matters that are of some consequence, but which are of urgency also. Should it not also be pointed out that any of these items would be subject to amendment to strike them out? Certainly it could be argued, as that point is reached, the prerogatives of the legislative committee had been invoked, and that possibly the matter would be better handled by action by the legislative committee. What I am saying is that I hope this rule is adopted in order that we may proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observations made by the distinguished majority leader. I want to supplement what he has said by saying that if the rule is adopted, thet House is not precluded from passing upon these items which are subject to a point of order. In other words, if this rule is adopted, the House will have the opportunity to vote on each of the items involved in this controversy. If the rule is not adopted, then these provisions will no doubt be stricken from the bill on points of order, in which event the House will hav eno opportunity to consider and pass upon the merits of these proposals. I therefore urge the adoption of the rule so that each Member may have the privilege of voting on these items as they are presented.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 12 minutes.

MOST RUTHLESS RULE IN 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. SABATH. This rule which has just been presented by my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] is in my belief the most ruthless and rigid, yes, the most outrageous, ever reported in the 40 years of my service in Congress.

The bill which this rule makes in order represents a complete and tragic disregard of the best interests of agriculture and of our country, a powerful and important segment of the American economy and American society. The bill intentionally violates organic farm legislation duly passed by the Congress.

The Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations, owing allegiance to none except the economic royalists who are the masters of the Republican party, have constituted themselves a dictatorship, a political and legislative obligarchy determined to rule or ruin.

They are presenting this vicious program without regard to right or to logic, or to the welfare of the farmers of our country. They are trying to jam this program through, without even giving the elected Representatives of the people an opportunity to express an opinion or to amend the bill.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE!

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have brought in rules which waived points of order; nevertheless I have criticized the Committee on Appropriations for presenting legislation in appropriation bills in violation of the standing rules of the House.

But what a difference, Mr. Speaker!

Those rules, Mr. Speaker, made in order the consideration of legislation designed to help American agriculture, not to ruin it. The legislation now before us will deprive the American farmer and American agriculture of the benefits of laws the Democrats passed in their behalf.

That is the difference between those rules I presented and this Republican gag rule. At a time when farmers were losing their farms by foreclosure, and those who had not already lost them were facing ruin under the staggering burden of 6 and 8 percent interest, we passed legislation which made it possible for them to survive. This bill would destroy many of those very laws.

CITY WORKERS PROSPER WHEN FARMERS PROSPER

Although I represent a purely city district, and have for over 40 years, I know that when the farmers are prosperous the city workers are prosperous. When the farmer is making a living he buys the tools for his farm and the clothes for his family the city worker makes, and he creates business and jobs and business is aided and work is made for the laborers.

Therefore, I have supported all progressive legislation to help keep farmers prosperous. This bill will keep farmers poor and eliminate city jobs.

I wish to call attention to some of the things I feel should be taken into consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am amazed by one of the arguments made by the distinguished majority leader in support of the rule, that if the House votes for the rule we then have the privilege of striking the matter out or moving to amend it. I have never heard that argument advanced before. That means that we are permitting organic law to be violated by this report when no emergency exists we then put the House in the position where the Members, who have already passed the organic law, try to strike it out or to have to offer amendments to strike out matter which could then be stricken out on a point of order because of the bill violating organic law. It is the first time I ever heard that argument made on any rule.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman, as is always the case, is right when he makes that statement.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a question, not for a speech.

Mr. HALLECK. The distinguished minority whip has referred to me, and the gentleman from Illinois in his usual gracious manner has commended the gentleman from Massachusetts for being right in his observation, but the gentleman from Massachusetts was as wrong as it is possible for anyone to be. All I said was, and I ask him to dispute it if he sees fit, or the gentleman from Illinois who for many years was chairman of the Rules Committee, that if this rule is adopted, when the bill is read, any item in here that will be subject to a point of order if this rule is not adopted would be subject to an amendment offered in the committee to strike it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is we have never employed that practice. If we do that, then we are making the Appropriations Committee a

super-House. All the Appropriations Committee would have to do is to come in at any time and report a rule depriving the Members of the opportunity to make a point of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me make this response to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. He recognizes by the statement he made that my statement is correct, that an amendment will lie to strike out the item that otherwise would be subject to a point of order. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have served here under his and other people's leadership when my side was in the minority and I have seen amendments offered to strike out items that otherwise would have been subject to a point of order except for the adoption of a rule in identical terms with this one. That is the reason this is not a precedent and that is the reason this rule should be adopted.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to make this observation. I have criticized the Appropriations Committee for bringing in legislation on an appropriation bill depriving the committees having jurisdiction of their rights and privileges. I have criticized that practice. The difference between those rules that were brought in when I was chairman of the Rules Committee and this rule is that those rules permitted amendments to be offered which would help the farmers, while this rule deprives the farmers of their rights and privileges if this bill should pass and is against their interest.

Now you are attempting to minimize the harm that this bill will do. With this kind of legislation you are going on record that you are against the best interests of the farmers. I have here in my hand a telegram from a gentleman with whom I have frequently disagreed, when he opposed legislation in the interest of labor, or supported legislation designed to do to organized labor what this bill would do to agriculture.

This telegram comes to me from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the National Farm Bureau. Time will not permit me to read the telegram here on the floor but I am inserting it at this point in my remarks, and when you read it here you must come to the conclusion that the objections he lodges against this bill are logical and true, and I am sure you will recognize the deep resentment felt by the Farm Bureau, for this legislation is condemned in the strongest language they could use:

FARMERS DEEPLY SHOCKED

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1947.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Farmers deeply shocked at several recommendations of House Appropriations Committee on Agricultural Appropriations. Our organization offered sincere aggressive support for real constructive economy by eliminating unnecessary personnel, excessive expenditures and duplication of services. But we asked committee not to cut heart out of farm program. Instead committee made most of savings at expense of farmers and vital farm program and failed to require reduction in many badly overstaffed agencies. Farmers are especially indignant over cut in 1947 $300,000,000 AAA conservation program specifically approved by Congress last year to $165,000,000, thereby breaking faith with millions of farmers and also complete elimination of program in 1948. Reduction of administrative expenses to fifteen million will make it impossible for State and county PMA offices to carry out this program successfully and to handle commodity loans and other price support functions vital to millions of farmers. Farmers in every section are alarmed over complete elimination of section 32 funds for surplus disposal which Congress has approved as permanent appropriations. Farmers also greatly concerned over failure to provide even first year allotment of research funds approved under Hope-Flannagan Act which passed almost unanimously last year. We favor strict economy but strongly protest foregoing actions as false economy and breaking faith with farmers. These vital programs were adopted by bipartisan votes in Congress. Millions of farmers are looking to you to rectify these injustices and keep faith with farmers above party by providing these vitally needed funds.

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
*President, American Farm Bureau Federation.*

I have received, and I know that all of you have received, hundreds of other communications condemning this vicious unjustifiable rule which will repeal many laws enacted by the Democrats and condemning the cuts made in the appropriation bills. I do not see why we should seriously consider this effort to save a few dollars when the first page of the financial section of the New York Times for Sunday, May 25, can headline a lead story in these words: "Industrial profit at record level—942 companies in 79 fields earned $3,656,933,912 last year, 34-percent rise over 1945—huge backlogs unbroken."

GREATEST ANNUAL RETURNS

This newspaper article starts out by saying:

Private enterprise in the United States in 1946, first full year of peacetime activity since the war's end, yielded one of the greatest annual returns in the Nation's history.

The writer goes on to discuss the different industrial groups and their profits. Here is a paragraph which means something to the housewife and to you:

Consumer-goods industries that were able to maintain a fairly high level of production made the best showings. Percentage profit increases of some of these reporting groups were: Furniture, 206 percent; home appliances, 98 percent; food, 43 percent; baking 146 percent; liquor, 120 percent; meat packing, 97 percent; silk and rayon, 178 percent; cotton, 378 percent; apparel, 128 percent; and tobacco, 46 percent.

By industries, here are the dividends reported for the 79 fields studied:

| | 1946 | 1945 |
|---|---|---|
| Heavy metals and allied (215 companies) | $533, 314, 703 | $414, 773, 404 |
| Chemicals and allied (101 companies) | 474, 004, 871 | 295, 211, 576 |
| Automotive, aviation, etc. (127 companies) | 373, 859, 804 | 495, 989, 524 |
| Furniture and structural (217 companies) | 444, 822, 609 | 309, 896, 374 |
| Food and light industries (229 companies) | 949, 302, 775 | 519, 052, 256 |
| Grand total (942 companies) | 3, 656, 933, 912 | 2, 738, 686, 374 |

RETAIL SALES UP AGAIN

Here is another paragraph on dividends from the same issue of the New York Times:

Dividend payments in the first 3 months of 1947 were about 23 percent higher than in the corresponding period last year, according to United Business Service. Of 661 New York Stock Exchange issues on which dividends were paid, more than half increased their payments over the same quarter of 1946, the UBS reported.

In all the papers you will find column after column in the financial pages showing how companies are paying dividends, not only current and regular dividends but extra dividends and stock dividends and even back dividends.

Another headline in the Times reads: "1946 Retail Trade 'Best in History'—Net Profits 122.8 percent Over 1945 Far Outstrip Other Years, Times Survey Shows."

Here are just a few paragraphs from the story:

(By Thomas F. Conroy)

That 1946 was the most favorable year in the history of retailing is fully borne out in the complete figures covering last year's operations which now have been issued by leading retail organizations.

Net profits far outstripped those of preceding year, rising 122.8 percent over 1945, while sales were 32 percent higher, according to a compilation of the annual reports of 59 retail companies made yesterday by the New York Times. Sales of these concerns exceeded $9,466,000,000.

The mail order and chain store companies had the largest gains in both profits and sales. The department stores were not far behind. Specialty shops were more affected by the wave of apparel and fur mark-downs which featured the fall season and their increases were not as large as those of the other two classifications.

Comparative figures on sales and profits of the companies included in the survey follow, with the number of companies indicated in parentheses:

MAIL ORDER, CHAIN STORES (22)

| | 1946 | 1945 | Percent change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sales | $6, 366, 950, 237 | $4, 781, 269, 486 | +33. 2 |
| Net profit | 330, 995, 586 | 148, 591, 093 | +122. 8 |
| **DEPARTMENT STORES (30)** | | | |
| Sales | $2, 964, 680, 814 | $2, 267, 343, 484 | +30. 8 |
| Net profit | 143, 181, 951 | 66, 335, 935 | +115. 8 |
| **SPECIALTY SHOPS (7)** | | | |
| Sales | $135, 014, 305 | $117, 694, 542 | +14. 7 |
| Net profit | 7, 313, 737 | 4, 234, 309 | +72. 7 |
| **GRAND TOTAL (59)** | | | |
| Sales | $9, 466, 645, 356 | $7, 166, 307, 512 | +32. 0 |
| Net profit | 481, 491, 274 | 219, 161, 337 | +119. 7 |

Lowering of Federal corporation taxes from their wartime peaks was the outstanding factor in the sharp rise in retail net profits. In many instances the reduction from the previous year in provision for Federal income taxes ranged around 35 percent, which represented a heavy addition to net. Allied Stores Corp., the leading department-store chain, for example, in 1946, had $30,903,752 in profits before Federal income taxes, made provision of $12,525,000 for such taxes, and had a net after taxes of $18,378,752. In 1945 the comparative figures were $27,470,401, $19,100,000, and $8,370,401, respectively.

I have here in my hand other reports from newspapers which show the unprecedented prosperity of business and industry, of mining, of farming. Pick up any daily newspaper with a financial

section, or the Wall Street Journal and other business and financial journals, or the business reporting services like Dun & Bradstreet or the National City Bank News Letter, and the evidence strikes you on every hand.

I am sure that all of you saw in the papers last week another story saying that the increase in retail business all over the country was 12 percent, and not just 4 percent to 11 percent as I stated on the floor before those final estimates were published.

THREATENS OUR GREATEST CROP OF ALL

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I feel that when the country is prosperous we should not deprive the farmers of their opportunity of continuing to contribute to the national prosperity. Therefore I feel strongly we should not by our act here take away the assistance provided by a Democratic Congress which has enabled the farmers to become prosperous and contented and self-respecting American citizens equal in every way to their city brethren, as they always were in industry and good citizenship.

I myself have at all times aided the passage of beneficial legislation which has helped the farmer to lift himself out of his misery and want and insecurity to today's prosperity.

But this bill would repeal section 32 of the act of 1935, and worst of all by reducing the school-lunch fund, when only last year the Congress affirmatively passed the basic legislation for it, will endanger our most important of all crops, our young people, our boys and girls, by taking away from many of them the extra hot lunches at low cost provided under the law.

When you look back 12 or 14 years, you know what the lot of the poor farmer was. It was the legislation that we passed that put them on their feet, and they have been prosperous ever since. With this legislation you arrest their efforts and you arrest the prosperity of our Nation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield, sir. I am sorry.

LOAN SHARKS AND HEARTLESS BANKERS

Are we, Mr. Speaker, going to turn the farmers back to the tender mercies of the loan sharks and the heartless bankers?

Are we going to restore the bankers' private tax of high interest, high insurance, high discounts, and precipitate a new flood of foreclosures and farm failures, and start a new generation of lost farmers on the road to nowhere?

If you do not remember the sad story of 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933, the farm strikes, the moratorium laws, the dumped milk, the forced auctions broken up by outraged farmers protecting their own, go back to the files of the daily papers of those years.

In your own office take down your copy of Agricultural Statistics and watch the changing picture of farm income, farm prices, interest, taxes, mortgage debt, and ask if you want to turn the clock back.

Never before in history have farmers made so much in proportion to what they have to spend. God knows prices are high, far too high, in my opinion; but at least the man who toils with his hands, who spends long hours in the fields and with his herds and orchards is making a decent living. He has a profitable spread between his expenses and his income. He is not ground down by a mortgage on which the interest just keeps up with his payments until a crop failure, when he loses everything.

PENNY-WISE, POUND-FOOLISH

This penny-wise, pound-foolish economy embodied in this bill will just play into the hands of the same Wall Street sharpshooters who have been hammering down the prices of sound investment stocks on the market.

They do not care where they make their money or who they hurt. One day these gambling manipulators will be selling stocks short to wipe out the equity of thousands of small investors; the next day they will be gambling with farm products on the commodities exchanges; and another day they will be speculating in farm lands, mortgages, and bonds, all to the detriment of the national economy and the best interests of the country, and bound to affect adversely the hard-working dirt farmer, and not only the farmer but the Nation.

It can be truly said of the farmers who have been used by the Republicans, and have to a great extent supported and aided the Republican party, "They who continue to serve the devil well, with hell he will repay."

VOTE AGAINST DRASTIC RULE

In view of all this, and more that I could say if time but permitted, I feel it is our duty to vote down this outrageous rule whereby the Committee on Appropriations has assumed a legislative jurisdiction which is not theirs, and is attempting not only to deprive the appropriate legislative committees of the right and privilege and power of bringing positive legislation to the floor which is properly theirs, but to repeal laws passed by previous Congresses.

Any member of the House who votes for this rule is voting against the farmers. If any Member votes for this bill and ties his own hands, and then later tries to tell his people he voted for amendments to restore any of the vicious cuts in the Agriculture Department budget, I warn the people of his district right now that he is falsifying his position to them.

This is worse than a gag rule. It is autocracy such as has not been seen on this floor since the days of Speaker Joe Cannon.

It is legislative tyranny of the worst kind.

Above all, it is your political suicide.

For your own interest, if you will not for the national interest, cast your vote against this drastic rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include articles and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself on this occasion in the position of opposition to the distinguished majority leader, the Rules Committee, and my distinguished friend from Illinois, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, but it is the same position that I have taken on many previous occasions, and the only position I think any member of a legislative committee of the House can take if we are going to maintain the integrity of the legislative committees.

It is not necessary, of course, to adopt this rule in order to bring the agricultural appropriation bill before the House. It is not necessary to have any rule to bring that bill before the House. If the rule is voted down, the only effect will be that the bill will be subject to points of order against legislative provisions which it contains.

I may say that although I have seen other appropriation bills brought into the House under a rule which permitted legislative provisions, I cannot recall that I have ever seen a bill which contained legislative provisions of the importance that are contained in this particular piece of legislation.

I am speaking now not only as a Member of the House but as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and by direction of that committee to appear and speak for the committee in opposition to this rule. There are in this bill at least six provisions that are pure legislation. Perhaps there are more. They are all important matters of legislation, matters that should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and matters that certainly deserve more consideration than the Appropriations Committee could possibly give them.

If you will look in the hearings you will find that these matters, although they are important legislation, were not considered by the Committee on Appropriations in open hearings. They were considered in executive sessions. The Congress is entitled to have more information on these matters of legislation than can possibly be secured in the debate upon this bill. All of these matters are matters that would require, if they were to be considered properly, hearings of some extent and duration on the part of the legislative committees.

In one respect certainly this bill goes further than any other appropriation bill has ever gone in the way of legislation, in that it repeals a permanent appropriation. I am referring now to section 32 of the Triple-A Act, which provides that each year there shall be set aside one-third of the customs revenues to be used in support of agriculture in the way of expanding consumption at home and abroad, in diverting agricultural products to other uses, and in supporting the prices of agricultural commodities. That is permanent legislation. It has been on the books for more than 10 years. Yet under this bill that appropriation is rescinded and the money is directed to be held in the Treasury.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the item to which the gentleman has referred, I might state that when that was approved unanimously by both sides of the aisle as being one instrument that might help in dealing with surplus commodities, both seasonal surpluses and national surpluses of farm products. I concur in what the gentleman has said, that this is an item that should receive more consideration.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for that statement. It is true, as he said, that this act was reported out unanimously by the committee. It has been on the books for more than 10 years. Its value has never been questioned.

I do not believe there has been any provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or any part of our general agricultural policy which has been of greater assistance to agriculture during that time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that if the money appropriated for the purpose intended by the act is not used, then the money goes back into the United States Treasury, and is thus saved to the country?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. No one can say at this moment how much of that money may be needed during the coming year. If none is needed, it all goes back into the Treasury. All we do if we keep the rescission provision in the bill is to make a paper saving because if the money is not used it goes back into the Treasury in any event. But no one knows what we may expect in the way of agricultural surpluses in the next year. There may be minor commodities or there may be important commodities with reference to which it may be necessary to take action under the provisions of this legislation.

But if we adopt the rule and retain in the bill this legislative provision, that would be impossible. But I do not want to say anything more about the merits of the matter. What I am speaking about is the legislative integrity of the House because under the law the Committee on Appropriations cannot legislate, and the legislative committees cannot appropriate. If we violate that principle by adopting this rule, then we are establishing a precedent which will be cited in the future when further attempts are made to undermine the integrity of the legislative committees.

What we are in effect doing is setting up the Committee on Appropriations as a great super committee of the House of Representatives which will undermine the authority, activity, and importance of the legislative committees.

When I say this I am speaking not only for the Committee on Agriculture but for every legislative committee of the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to comment on the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and also on what the minority whip had to say. When they were in control of the House they brought in similar gag rules which waived all points of order. Our committee tried to perfect legislation so such procedure could be avoided. We did pass legislation which is now law so that the practice followed by our side in this respect does not differ at all from that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] did when he was chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HOPE. The position taken by the Committee on Agriculture is the position which has always been taken by that committee when the Committee on Appropriations on previous occasions has brought in a bill containing legislative provisions. I think I may say with all deference to this particular subcommittee that no subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has brought in more bills which contained legislative provisions. It seems to be a habit with that committee, a habit which I thought we had put an end to a few years ago when we had a show-down on that proposition and the Committee on Rules finally refused an application for a rule.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the gentleman feel that if this practice continues there will be no need to have a Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOPE. There is no question at all but what every time we adopt a rule of this kind we undermine all the legislative committees and take a step toward making the Committee on Appropriations a big super committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, that the pending proposal is detrimental to sound and desirable agricultural legislation could have no finer witness than the gentleman from Kansas who has just taken his seat. I am not able to go back 40 years, as my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has done, but I can go back far enough in service on the Rules Committee to state just a little about the background of this situation.

In the course of the recovery program, sometimes referred to as the New Deal, various and sundry agricultural programs were established for which there was no specific authority in law. I might mention the Rural Electrification Administration or I might mention the school lunches or I might mention some 69 other important items.

As we went along the Appropriations Committee would come from time to time before the Rules Committee and ask us for a rule waiving points of order on agricultural bills because of the absence of any legislation specifically establishing those programs. We worked along with that from year to year, and at the same time we kept threatening to give the Committee on Agriculture a legislative spanking if they did not get busy and supply the necessary legislation, which was complained about continuously by the minority party in those years. I think some of the distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture were before us when we talked this over. Then, finally, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has said, we served somewhat of an ultimatum and told them they would have to get legislation or we would quit granting rules waiving points of order. We did get legislation establishing some 71 of these programs, and that fixed the policy of the Congress on this question. Now we are proposing to give them a legislative spanking because they have done what we threatened to spank them for not doing. You are not only headed for a procedure that is detrimental to agriculture if you adopt this rule—and the only reason I am speaking is to get my voice in the RECORD against it—but you are heading into legislative chaos and you are simply vesting ing in the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, down in a little closed room somewhere, the power to determine the agricultural policy of this Congress, insofar as a committee may do so, without the people who are interested having any opportunity at all to be heard and present their case.

There is a great stack of telegrams on my desk that have a very vital ring. If I were to look over on the majority side, I would be disposed to say a dangerous ring. I had to wire them back that, if the procedure was adopted, the policy of this Congress with regard to agriculture would have been changed in many vital respects, without the people who are most directly concerned having any opportunity whatever to present their views. If that is what you want to do, this is the way to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, since I am a Democrat, I doubt that the Members of the majority body are going to be governed by what I say when I speak against this rule. I would like to call attention, however, to the fact that the issue is whether the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, is to write the agricultural policy of the Republican Party. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois will tell you he has never been in favor of section 32. Section 32 funds are repealed under this act. Time after time in this committee it has been brought up, and I am sure he will agree with this, that he felt that provision should not be made for carrying on those activities of the Department of Agriculture under section 32, but that appropriations should be made annually by the Appropriations Committee. Of course, that would come under the jurisdiction and control of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and would permit him to largely control the agricultural policy of his party and therefore of the Congress.

Last year we had a bill passed in this Congress which became law, which provides for the control of Government corporations. The Commodity Credit Cor-

poration is one of those corporations, and it went to the committee of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. But this year we find that our good friend—and he is very persuasive and a fine fellow—we find that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations has gone to the chairman of the whole committee and taken over Commodity Credit Corporation, one of the corporations that would go ordinarily and did last year to the other committee. We find that this distinguished gentleman has also taken over half of the Farm Credit Administration, which also belonged to the committee of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I say to you that if this committee this year is permitted—and I am a member of that committee—if they are permitted to repeal section 32 of this law for 1 year that in effect it is repealed and it is gone. This committee takes unto itself the power to stop the flow of those funds, money that is set aside under the basic law to the credit of agriculture. If you are not going to be permitted to use it as it was recommended by the budget, let us transfer those funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation for its use in carrying out this program so that the American farmer will receive the credit for this money which under the basic law is set aside to help him through his problems and to offset the disadvantages of bringing agricultural products into this country in competition with his own. I made the motion in the committee but was overridden. And there again they turned down my efforts to retain those funds which have meant more to agriculture than perhaps any other piece of agricultural legislation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My colleague on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture well knows that I was with him in opposing asking for a rule upon this particular bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker,, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and other members of the subcommittee opposed the granting of the rule. It is true that in times past we have had rules on bills containing agricultural legislation from the Appropriations Committee, but I wish to call your attention to the fact that in each of those cases we had no legislation for the Farm Security Administration, we had no legislation for the school-lunch program, and in practically every instance—and, in fact, in every instance I recall—the chairman of the subcommittee was joined by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in asking and in obtaining a rule to bring into this Congress legislation under which this matter could be considered.

But I say to you that this bill will reflect that there is a tremendous difference between the attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] as to what is for the best interests of agriculture; and I will say that if this rule is adopted, then you are forsaking the ordinary legislative processes and saying that the chairman of this subcommittee shall fix the policy of the Republican Party with reference to agriculture. This bill reflects that attitude here today because certainly I know that the members of the Agriculture Legislative Committee would never bring into this Congress a bill to repeal section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. If you will study the uses of those funds for the last 10 years, you will see that in the case of wheat, in the period around 1937, when the granaries of this country were so filled with surplus wheat that the farmers could not even store the wheat they gathered, this is the fund that bailed them out. This is the fund that bailed out the poultry producers and the producers of walnuts and raisins, the producers of various other crops throughout the country, including cotton from my own area. Now, to adopt this rule means that you are permitting the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to write the party ticket of the Republican Party—a ticket that says you are repealing that act and taking away those funds—and I say that is not in accord with the desires of the majority of you men on that side of the aisle.

If you defeat this rule, you defeat the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois to repeal section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, yet if you adopt the rule, you cannot be heard to say that you did not make it possible for section 32 to be repealed. You will have contributed to the destruction of one of the greatest provisions in the law for handling surplus agricultural products—a provision which has saved the wheat farmers, the poultry growers, other grain producers, and cotton farmers. The responsibility for destroying that great program will rest on those of you who approve this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 6 minutes.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding—and if my understanding is incorrect I wish to be corrected—the Committee on Agriculture are unanimously opposed to the adoption of this rule. That action was taken at a meeting either this morning or yesterday. In view of that fact it seems rather strange that we witness what is attempted in this appropriation bill. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], one of the most respected Members of the House, whether he is a member of the majority party or the minority party, and he demands the respect of us on our side, should be the spokesman of his party in this branch on matters concerning agriculture.

I think the RECORD should show that anyone who votes for this rule is voting against the interests of the farmer and later if they vote for the rule and then try to tell the farmers of their district, "Why, I voted for amendments to increase the appropriation," they are engaging in what might properly be termed "political hypocrisy."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for more than 20 years. In all those years in dealing with agricultural problems we have not engaged in partisan politics. I do not like to see the gentleman trying to inject partisan politics into this issue.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is entirely mistaken because I am following the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is a Republican; so there is no partisan politics in my position. The gentleman, of course, is a very adroit politician himself and he has the very pleasant habit of trying to accuse others of motives which they do not entertain.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman for the rule?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I am for the gentleman. And so the gentleman is with me. He is playing politics at that rate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me go ahead. I only have a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] tried to justify a vote for the rule by saying, "You can amend later on." But you are tying your hands. A lot of these provisions can be stricken out on a point of order and these are provisions in the bill that change the organic law, that came out of the Committee on Agriculture, passed this branch and the other branch, and became law. The distinction between the rules of the past waiving points of order and this one is that invariably in the past it was where the Appropriations Committee made an appropriation for some activity for which there was no authority in law. This is a rule repealing in whole or in part existing law or parts of existing organic law. There is a marked difference between the rules reported out in the past making in order an activity in an appropriation bill for which there was no authority. This type of rule repeals in part or in whole some of the important provisions relating to agriculture.

Let me show you how far the Appropriations Committee went in its attempt to do a job and there is no question but what there is a job being done on agriculture in this bill. I call your attention to the National School Lunch Act provision, which concerns cities too, reading:

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946, $45,000,000.

They cut it from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. But what did they do further? Did they stop there? No.

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

In other words, whoever in the Appropriations Committee conceived that and whoever voted for it not only had in mind a sharp reduction in the school-lunch program but they went further and they did a job on the school-lunch program because the little amount paid for school lunches has been used in the past as a part of the State's fund, and the organic act permits it to be used in that way, and that is matching the Federal fund.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I point out the legislative features of this appropriation bill deprive agriculture of about $183,000,000 without giving the Legislative Committee of the House any opportunity at all to even discuss the matter with farm leaders and farm officials of the Department of Agriculture.

It seems to me that it is a very important matter when legislation of this kind can be brought in on an appropriation bill and the farmers of this country deprived of a substantial sum of money to the tune of $183,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it produces great harm to the conservation program, to the price-control-support program, to the veterans' program, to the small farmers, to the lunch-school program, as well as other activities.

I might make this brief observation. It is rather interesting that every time I take the floor I am accused of politics, and when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] takes the floor he is not accused of it. I am not accusing him of playing politics. He is doing his job, and I respect him, and I do not accuse the gentleman of engaging in politics in trying to have the rule adopted, but any time one of the Democratic leadership takes the floor—and you better stop it in the future—they are accused of engaging in politics. That could work both ways. We do not accuse the Republican leaders of it, and when the gentleman is taking the position he is taking he is only doing his job, and I admire him for it, although if I could look into his mind and read his thoughts, he is disgusted with the action taken by the majority of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated that he can look into my mind and determine what is going on with respect to this matter. I do not have to look into his mind or the mind of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], or some of the others who have spoken over there, to see what is going on in their minds.

Now, they cannot distinguish this rule in any real particular from rule after rule that they brought out here and asked us to support and which many of us did support. The thing that disturbs them is that the items in this bill that might be subject to a point of order are going to save the Government and the taxpayers some money, and that is just completely abhorrent to them. Why, they cannot be for economy in Government. They cannot be for saving the taxpayers any money, so they adopt this position of opposition to this rule, not because of any great solicitude for those of us on this side, but because they are just following the old pattern that has been in evidence here every day since we first met last January 3, which is one of stubborn opposition to every move we make to try to cut the cost of Government.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the devil can cite Scripture to his purpose. It is so very obvious that the discussion here indicates that those who oppose the rule are more interested in the subject matter of the bill than in the technicalities of committee jurisdiction.

Now, let me make it abundantly clear what is involved here today. This rule is worth $183,000,000. Many rules cannot be interpreted in terms of money. This one can. The action by the Committee in rescinding what is known as so-called section 32 funds, which consist of 30 percent of customs receipts which are permanently appropriated, will be stricken from this bill on a point of order if the rule is not granted, and the $383,000,000 saving that the committee labored to bring in here will be reduced from $383,000,000 to $235,000,000. That is involved in this rule. We had the benefit of the testimony. The discussion you hear here today is predicated not upon testimony but rather upon a technical consideration or a political consideration. This committee has taken testimony for 7 weeks. We had 411 witnesses before the subcommittee. It has taken us 3 months to bring this bill here. We have taken very advised action in the matter.

After battling through the subcommittee, the full committee, and the Rules Committee, and supporting the rule on the floor of the House, if we now cannot have a rule then take $183,000,000 of economy out of this bill. On the 20th of February you all voted on the legislative budget. The vote was 229 to 174. To the call of the roll your voice intoned that you were in favor of trying to achieve a $6,000,000,000 economy. We bring in here a bill in support of that thesis. Are you going to cripple our efforts now on a technicality?

It is said that this is a departure from custom. I do not see the gentleman from Missouri on the floor just now, who was at one time the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of which I am now the chairman. Year after year I went to the Rules Committee with him. I stood at his right hand and helped him ask for a rule to protect the bill, and no one will deny it. Here today we are marshalling the facts and marshalling the record. There is no departure here. We have gone through this sort of business in other years. Always I have stood with your chairman asking to get a rule, even though it was being fussed over on this side, because there was little of partisanship and politics in the subcommittee on Agricultural appropriations.

I served on the Reorganization Committee with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who did a marvelous job; and how long we battled on this thing—18 months—and then brought in a bill with a bridge title and a retirement title and a pay increase. We had a provision in there to take all legislative matters out of appropriations. You could not even report an appropriation bill with a legislative matter in it. What happened? We sat down with the leadership not only on our side but on your side as well, and we took it out, so that it applies today to the Senate but not to the House of Representatives. You approved that bill with that item stricken. Will you stand here now, depart from the record, and give us that kind of opposition?

I sometimes wonder why a Member of the House who is in his right mind will take service on the Appropriations Committee and eat his heart out month after month to scare up a few dollars for the American taxpayers, and then be so constantly challenged by technicalities upon the floor. If you want to throw that $183,000,000 out the window, all right. You have as many prerogatives, as many privileges, as much power, and as many rights here as I have. But it will be noted on the record whether you will escape or not under these circumstances if you take $183,000,000 out of this bill.

You are not foreclosed in your rights. You can strike out the rescission provision on section 32 when the bill is read for amendment. If you do not like what we did on meat inspection when we are trying to put the inspection fee upon the packers and save $6,000,000 for the Treasury this year and another $5,000,000 next year, you can move to strike it out. If you do not like what we have done with REA in sending them directly to the Treasury instead of circuitously through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without changing their interest rate or their prerogatives or their priorities or anything else, you are free to strike it out by an amendment on the floor. There is not an item covered in this rule that you cannot strike out. But you see, you test it on its merits. It is not the arbitrary fact that you can stand and say, "Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order," and then suddenly, without testing the merits of the provision, throw it out the window. Is that the way you are going to dispose of the $183,000,000 of economy involved?

This committee does not try to usurp the prerogatives of any other committee. But try to write an agriculture appropriation bill with a thousand and one different provisions in it and try to squeeze out of it a little economy, and see the difficulties that you run into. It is a regular wilderness of technicality. You have to be so serpentine and sinuous in your tread in order finally to get a bill that will stand up and effect a little econ-

omy and avoid, insofar as it can, legislative provisions.

There is not a single legislative provision in this bill that is not coupled with an economy.

Meat inspection—there is an economy of $6,140,000.

Section 32—the economy is $148,000,000.

If we did not do it, that $148,000,000 would be a loose roving amount of money that would not find its way back into the Treasury until the end of the fiscal year 1948, which is a year from next June.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that we could allocate $148,000,000 of AAA funds to take care of this particular section 32 fund?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall point that out.

Mr. Speaker, were we so profane in this matter? The President of the United States, who is of the opposite political persuasion, took $100,000,000 out of section 32 and put it into the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which meant the conservation-payment fund. The President and the Bureau of the Budget did that. Perhaps it was subject to a point of order, but when we go to the merits of the matter, have we then been so profane?

With respect to the other $48,000,000, it was a pretty nebulous case, as I shall seek to point out in the general discussion, and I shall cite you line and page of the scripture to prove it, instead of drawing it out of thin air with some kind of speculation or some kind of conjecture.

Then there is the Rural Electrification Administration. We were quite generous with that, I thought.

Here, at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials and with the approval of the Budget Division of the Department of Agriculture, the language in the bill was submitted. They said instead of borrowing by first going through the Administrator and the Secretary and then the RFC and then the Treasury Department, why not go directly to the Treasury. It does not prejudice them in their operations whatsoever. It will save three-quarters of 1 percent because that is what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation takes out.

Then, for its administrative work it puts people on the pay roll. It is coupled then with the saving of $25,000,000 in cash and it then makes inoperative the 85-percent collateral provision under which they operated and it does them good rather than harm because it facilitates and expedites their operations. There can be no quarrel about it.

Gentlemen, are we going to test these things on their merits or are we going to throw them out the window? There is ample precedent for what we do today—abundant precedent, if you please. And not a single Member of this House is foreclosed when we are in Committee of the Whole from his opportunity to say, "Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the rescission title of section 32 funds." And that amendment will be in order. Not a single member is foreclosed in his opportunity to say, "Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the provision on meat inspection." And that amendment will be in order. No Member is foreclosed in his right to say, "Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the provision on Rural Electrification Administration." And it will be in order. Or to say, "Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso on AAA funds." And it will be in order. In every case we will test the whole controversy on its every merit instead of just throwing it out the window on a technicality. So, I say to you, after 3 months of endeavor we would like to have this rule. I appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday morning. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] was there. He opposed the rule. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was there. He opposed the rule. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] was there. He opposed the rule. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was there. He opposed the rule. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was there. He opposed the rule. I sought in my humble and feeble way to say, "Give us an opportunity to bring this matter to the floor of the House and let the Members of the Congress work their will on these provisions. Let us not be diverted by some question of legislative or technical jurisdiction." Now, that is the whole question that is involved here.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman seems to regard this matter as a mere technicality, of very slight importance. I know the gentleman is usually very frank. I wonder if the gentleman will not confess to the House that this is a bold invasion of the prerogatives of the House Committee on Agriculture, of which the chairman is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, let us see what a bold invasion this is. When the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was the chairman of this committee, after years of urging on my part, we changed the character of soil-conservation payments so as to make them conservation and use payments instead of subsidies. We did that in an appropriation bill. I went up there with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and helped get a rule on it. I went with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the Rules Committee to get a rule to cover an amendment on agricultural credit as it related to the Agricultural Credit Corporation. We had to draw language in such involved fashion that hardly a Philadelphia lawyer could understand it, but it was still subject to a point of order. Just like Herminius stood at Horatius' right arm at the bridge on the Tiber, I stood there with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and said, "Give us a rule," and I have been doing it for 10 years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. So the gentleman is consistent in his policy and his contention that the integrity of the legislative committees should not be so carefully guarded?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, no. Let me comment on that. That is not what the gentleman from Illinois has in mind. I say to you, out of a humble heart, if you could serve for 1 or 2 years on an appropriation committee and see what labyrinthian wilderness of restrictions we operate under, that taxes the facility of the General Accounting Office to the point where the Comptroller General is fairly beside himself and says, "For God's sake, let us get some relief from this great labyrinthian bureaucracy with all of its fiscal restrictions"—if you have 1 year of experience your heart would be filled to overflowing with sympathy for the 43 members who go through that labor year after year.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the gentleman yesterday state to the Rules Committee that being chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations it was almost impossible for the gentleman and his committee to write an appropriation bill without inveighing the prerogatives of the legislative committees and writing legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no; it is not quite what the gentleman from Illinois said. What the gentleman from Illinois said to the Rules Committee was that it is pretty difficult and sometimes an almost impossible thing to prepare an appropriation bill and achieve the kind of economies that we effected and not drift over a little bit into this field of legislative jurisdiction. There is not a chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittees who will not bear me out in the difficulties under which we labor.

So, in the best of grace, let us test this thing out on its merits, approve this rule, and let us see whether or not this House wants to initiate a saving of $183,000,000 that is involved in this rule today. It is your question to decide.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 130, noes 103.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 170, answered "present" 2, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—189

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Boggs, Del. | Carson |
| Anderson, Calif. | Bolton | Case, N. J. |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Bradley | Chadwick |
| Angell | Brehm | Chenoweth |
| Arends | Brophy | Chiperfield |
| Arnold | Brown, Ohio | Church |
| Bakewell | Buck | Clason |
| Banta | Buffett | Clevenger |
| Bates, Mass. | Burke | Clippinger |
| Beall | Busbey | Coffin |
| Bennett, Mo. | Butler | Cole, Kans. |
| Bishop | Byrnes, Wis. | Cole, Mo. |
| Blackney | Canfield | Cole, N. Y. |

Corbett
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dondero
Eaton
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Goodwin
Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hinshaw
Hoffman
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kersten, Wis.
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Maloney
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Murray, Wis.
Norblad
O'Hara
Owens
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Springer
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—170

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Bonner
Boykin
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chapman
Clark
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cravens
Crosser
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dolliver
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Gathings
Goff
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hagen
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Hope
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
Kirwan
Larcade
Lemke
Lesinski
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Md.
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Norton
O'Brien
O'Konski
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Peden
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rankin
Rayburn
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sheppard
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Stefan
Stigler
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hill
Talle

NOT VOTING—68

Allen, Ill.
Auchincloss
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Chelf
Clements
Colmer
Cox
Curtis
Dingell
Domengeaux
Eberharter
Fuller
Gary
Gifford
Gillie
Grant, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hand
Hart
Hébert
Heffernan
Jenkins, Pa.
Jonkman
Keefe
Kelley
Kilburn
King
Klein
Knutson
Lane
Lanham
Lea
Lynch
McDowell
Macy
Madden
Mansfield, Tex.
Merrow
Miller, Nebr.
Morrison
Nixon
Nodar
Norrell
Peterson
Pfeifer
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Powell
Rabin
Rayfiel
Redden
Riley
Rooney
Sarbacher
Scoblick
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Shafer
Somers
Spence
Teague
Weichel

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Jonkman for, with Mr. Hill against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Talle against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Cox against.

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Sarbacher for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Lea against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Burleson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Curtis with Mr. Rabin.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Teague.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Kelley.

Mr. Nixon with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Rayfiel.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. GRANT, who is absent on official business. Were he present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ROBERTSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how I was recorded? I had a pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JONKMAN. I voted "no." I wish to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The vote has been announced and the time when the gentleman could have announced how he would have voted has passed—except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. But, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk read the pair himself.

The SPEAKER. That is true, but the gentleman himself had voted. He should have addressed the Chair and requested that he be recorded as "present."

Is there objection to the gentleman from Colorado changing his vote? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Colorado will be recorded as having been paired in opposition to the rule.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion, and pending that may I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the time be equally divided, that we run on more or less indeterminately today with the hope that before the Committee rises we probably will be able to read at least the first section of the bill and perhaps a little more.

Mr. CANNON. I think the division of the time can very well be arranged, but we should proceed without further limitation until we know just how many wish to be heard. I trust nobody will be denied an opportunity to be heard during general debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insofar as that can be complied with, that certainly will be the rule; but in view of the fact that time is of the essence and so many Members want to get away Thursday, as expressed earlier by the majority leader, I hope we can complete the bill tomorrow. Therefore, whatever progress we can make today will be in good stead as we begin deliberations on Wednesday.

Mr. CANNON. I am very glad to cooperate with the gentleman from Illinois in the hope that we will be able to make good progress with the understanding that no definite arrangement is made as to reading any particular part of the bill today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee wishes to be rather clear on what is contemplated here. It is hoped we will be able to read at least the first paragraph tonight and perhaps a little more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that de-

bate on the bill run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3601, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1948, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, with the general proposition in this bill, insofar as it would follow the New Deal program, which involved the regimentation of the farmers of America, I am in disagreement; that is to say, that is what the program accomplished. I am opposed to it lock, stock, and barrel.

The time has come, unfortunately or fortunately for the Republican Party, to strip demagogery and socialism from the New Deal program and make one of our own. All of the programs of the New Deal tend to one or the other of the dilemmas I have enumerated above.

While I did not, and do not, agree with all the items contained in the program, I am in favor of many of them.

This is no time for any American to count what votes it will cost him to oppose or to support a program. He must have the courage of his convictions. This is the time for anybody with intestinal fortitude to stand out for his country despite the penalty he may pay to demagogs and self-seekers.

Over the last few years during the war there has grown up all over the country a group of New Dealers or Socialists, who believe this is a good government to live under, so long as they can live off it. Do not forget it. These people forget that they are themselves paying for all this Government assistance, and doubly, for they pay in and for administration and its distribution.

We need to economize; and to do it, instead of talking about it, is the only way to have economy prevail. We must eliminate, cut down, and save to the utmost. Expenditures throughout the Government have pyramided beyond reason and our ability to carry on.

Attempts to threaten or coerce Members of Congress to vote for or against measures are un-American approaches. The average hard-working farmer who is a member of the Grange or the Farm Bureau does not know and would not approve of the methods the "big boys" employ as they earn their salaries out of the pockets of the average farmer. It is a shame.

I have lived my life in Vermont. I am for Vermont. I do not have to prove it. I am for Vermont farmers and their welfare. I do not have to say so. I will try to see that their needs are met and cared for. They know it.

I hate hypocrisy and demagoguery, and the spending of the money of my Vermont friends to try to carry on a Henry Wallace program. I am opposed to it. We need to get back to the old-fashioned honesty of hard work and a fair price for its products. God knows when we will ever reach that discretion. I do not need to be told how to vote.

This bill is both a threat and a promise. Demagogs will call it all kinds of names, and hypocrites will label it others. While I am opposed to some of its provisions, it is really a step toward a 100-percent America for the farmers of America. It needs some trimming; I admit it and am for it. It will get it.

Agriculture is the most essential industry in the world. It has long been one of the most independent of industries. The farmer who owned his farm and managed his own business independently and paid his own way was a king. He should be allowed to operate without Government interference.

Organization is all right if not too comprehensive. A too far-reaching control from the Government becomes arbitrary and dictatorial. It will speed the end of the small farmer.

This bill undertakes to place the responsibility for the farm program back on the farm. To try to mark up the program for the future is to try to count the stars in the Milky Way.

The bill is not perfect. There are amendments which should be made, which I will support. I will support the bill as it probably will be amended.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I first compliment the chairman of our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for the very fair and considerate manner in which he has handled the operations of this subcommittee. Certainly, we eight members of this subcommittee have not always agreed. No bill contains more controversial matters than does the one now before the House. The problems have been approached strictly on a basis of nonpartisan consideration, and as to what is best for our Nation. Never once do I recall during the nearly 2 months we were in session that any political red herrings were dragged into these hearings by members of the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to serve with not only the other members of the majority of this committee, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. PHILLIPS of California, but also with the members of the minority, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. WHITTEN.

It has been my endeavor to consider the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, which represents in the Government my personal industry, in exactly the same manner in which those for Labor and Federal Security were considered. This consideration has been based entirely upon one thing only: Just how much money is absolutely necessary for the efficient operation of the numerous bureaus making up this Department? Where can we cut without harm to the people of America?

Today the United States is faced with the grim reality of having a national debt of $259,000,000,000. We must put our own house in order financially if we are to weather successfully the storms ahead. We do not know how many more thousands of millions of dollars we will be called upon to lend or to practically give away to small nations in an effort to keep them from going behind the iron curtain of communism. Some say, "Why should we be so careful in trying to make savings in our domestic budgets and at the same time see these savings more or less nullified by huge loans to foreign countries?" The two do not come within the same category, in my opinion. The former are for peacetime administration through our various departments of government, while the latter are for emergency loans made in the hope that they will prevent a third world war.

In considering this Department of Agriculture budget now before us, we approach it, first of all, with the knowledge that $1,188,571,318 has been requested by the President for the operation in the fiscal year 1948, commencing this coming July 1, of this one division of government. The subcommittee very carefully considered each and every one of the hundreds of items, and patiently listened to whoever might care to be heard relative to any of them. We have brought to the floor of this House today a bill which I feel, generally speaking, to be good in the main, having accomplished a reduction of $383,427,742. This is a contribution from the farmers of America toward the balancing of our National Budget. The farmers have just as great a stake in our financial security as has any other group. In my opinion, they are happy to make what little sacrifices might be asked of them in this bill in order that our Nation's financial house and its affairs be made strong and stable.

Now, my friends, just digressing a moment, when I voted "no" on the rule I did not vote to increase the money in this bill by $148,000,000, because certainly, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] well knows, we could in the Committee here later specify, if we wished to do so, that $148,000,000 of the allocation for triple-A, which is now a direct appropriation, could be taken out of section 32 funds. So, with all due respect to my good chairman's eloquence and his persuasiveness, I did not feel that the item, as far as economy was concerned, was affected in any way by a "yes" or "no" vote up on the rule. I have always opposed the asking of a rule for appropriation bills. We must and should respect the rights of the legislative committees of the House.

Might I state in reference to a 1-minute speech made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] here today, in which he pleaded for more appropriations for REA, that REA will have available on the 1st of July $550,000,000 for construction purposes. Do you know that REA has today allocated, but not

expended, $325,000,000? That is the testimony of Mr. Wickard before our subcommittee. We are giving them an additional $225,000,000 here, and surely, with better than half a billion, this subcommittee has done well by REA. We have seen to it that every cent that REA can legitimately expend, when we consider the cost of labor and material, is given to them in this particular bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am rather interested in the gentleman's comments about REA. I have received a number of telegrams from local REA associations expressing concern about some of these cuts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Might I say to the gentleman from South Dakota, in the first instance, that it is just too bad that certain parties have misrepresented the action of our subcommittee in this matter. There are no better friends of REA in Congress than are upon this subcommittee—Democrats as well as Republicans. May I assure the gentleman that every cent that REA can properly use is available for that great project the coming fiscal year. We want it completed as soon as possible so as to bring to every farm home in America this wonderful convenience.

Mr. MUNDT. I know the gentleman from Minnesota has been a long-time friend and supporter of REA.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I state to the gentleman that REA provides the light and electricity for my home farm in Minnesota.

Mr. MUNDT. It is gratifying to have the assurance that if this appropriation passes in the form it is now before the House the expansion and projection of REA to areas which are not now served can be continued without any crippling of the legitimate program. I think that is the gentleman's assurance, is it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Absolutely, and the entire subcommittee feels as I do.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. This fund for administrative expenses is cut approximately one-third. The gentleman would not take the position that that would not necessarily mean that applications for extensions and the approval of new loans and class B loans would be delayed. The gentleman hopes that it will not, but the gentleman cannot give us any assurance of that, can he?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have a very high regard for my friend from Mississippi but must differ with him because, after all, we have reached a certain pattern in the allocation of these loans and it is not necessary—and I have this word from some of my associations back home—for these engineers, accountants, and so forth, to come out there continuously from the national headquarters and tell them what to do. These allocations, as the gentleman from Mississippi well knows, are mainly for B, C, and D projects, and surely it is not now necessary to extend the same degree of supervision.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right; in reference to the kind of allocations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not agree with the gentleman that we have done anything but good for the REA when we instill in them a little caution toward economy. After all, why should not they, as well as any other governmental agency, take their share of the cut. Four million dollars is going to give them ample money with which to do a good job.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman will agree that the applications for class B loans and other loans which should provide for area coverage still must come into Washington and be approved here, and these administrative funds are necessary to take care of them?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly they must come into Washington, but not with all the red tape attached to the preceding ones. As I said, the pattern has been set. I think it is time to get some of those attorneys out of the Solicitor's office as well as some of the numerous employees out of the REA. These people can do something more worthwhile for the Government than they are doing in those particular positions.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Is the economy being made in REA largely on administrative expenses?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Practically entirely in connection with the administrative expenses. One-tenth only of the money asked for to extend lines was refused.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. It is not on the construction of lines?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We gave to the REA in this bill 90 percent of what they asked for as far as loan authorizations are concerned. Remember that that $225,000,000 is piled upon the other $325,000,000 which is also available for construction, having been allocated but not expended as yet. Look at Mr. Wickard's testimony to that effect on page 1486 of the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I notice the report states that the $4,000,000 exceeds the amount appropriated for 1945 for REA. I wonder how that $4,000,000 figure compares with the amount they received in 1946.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In 1945 they had available for administrative expenses $3,246,000. In 1946 the amount was $4,340,000 and $5,500,000 in 1947. If we are ever to balance our budget and get down to sanity in the line of expending money, each and every agency of this great, rambling structure of the United States Government will have to take its proportionate cut. Much as I regard REA, no agency should be exempt from the trimming which absolutely must be done.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. This is the point in which I am vitally concerned. We know that in 1945 there was no possibility of expansion and extension of the REA lines because it was impossible to get the necessary materials and equipment to expand.

Will this $4,000,000 figure hamper or hinder or delay the expansion of REA lines to those communities which are not now served?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not feel that this reduction in administrative expenses will do anything but good.

Mr. MUNDT. In line with what the gentleman has said, and in further support of his position, reducing the amount of bureaucracy somewhat might cut some of the red tape and actually expedite the operations instead of delaying them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel that that would apply to almost any Government agency today. We spend about $34,000,000,000 for food for all of our 140,000,000 people. The President has asked for $37,500,000,000 for expenses of Government. Think of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, of the proportion of the $225,000,000 which would become available for lines, is not the amount allowed for administrative funds of the REA, namely, $4,000,000, larger than they have had some years?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for answer to that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say to my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota, that on almost one-half of the amount requested they energized twice as much line in 1940 as they did in 1946.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was referring to administrative expenses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is what I am referring to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, they certainly ought to be able to get along on this $4,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely; they could have gone on with less. We thought the committee was extremely generous on that.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. From the beginning I have believed in the efficacy and the good work of the REA. We all know that it has shifted many of the burdens and much drudgery from the backs of men and women to the muscles of iron and steel driven by electricity. But I object to much of the information and propaganda which has been sent out misleading our people trying to convince them that the failure of some farmers to get electricity is the result of the failure of Congress to appropriate such funds. I have voted for appropriations and for increased appropriations for the REA. The reason that some of the farmers in the various districts cannot get electricity is due not to the failure of Congress to pass sufficient appropriations to meet their needs, but rather to the costly, cumbersome, and inefficient administration of the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct. In my opinion, many of these so-called friends of rural electrification are doing that great work a disservice in bringing needless pressure upon the Members of this House who have proven themselves time and again on both sides to be real friends of the REA. We will give REA every dime they need, but at the same time we do not intend to put more money on the shelf than is necessary.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I hope there is no misunderstanding about this money that is now available as the gentleman mentions. I do not understand the gentleman to tell us there are $325,000,000 now available for allocation for loans to a cooperative that either wants to extend its lines or is now starting in business? That money has already been allocated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It has been allocated but not expended.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But the money is there and they will have it for construction purposes, when needed and when the materials and labor are available.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, but the gentleman did not intend to say that even the $225,000,000 will all be expended before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I do not think it is necessary that it should be. Most of it will be allocated, however.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly it will be allocated during this coming year. The $325,000,000 which has been mentioned does not add 1 penny to the amount of money that is available to take care of your people who do not now have lines. The $225,000,000 is all the money that is being made available during the next fiscal year to take care of people not now signed up. Is that not right?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the subcommittee has made every necessary provision as far as funds are concerned to keep this great project going in high gear. What more can the REA people ask?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It has been my observation and experience—and I think I am in a position to know, because I am down there in the middle of TVA, where there is an unlimited quantity of electric power—that the trouble about the extension of this REA service is the inability of those who desire it or those who furnish it to obtain transformers and other equipment in the way of wire. That is the great trouble.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And that will continue to be the great problem this coming year. More than ever that backs up the action of the subcommittee in doing what we have done. We have perhaps made more money available than they can ever use, but we want to be sure REA has enough.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is absolutely right about that. The question is to get these facilities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the Secretary of Agriculture himself in a letter told the committee that in all probability it will be as much as 20 months before they can get these transformers.

Mr. JENNINGS. There is not a bit of doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I continue with my speech, from which I have digressed to answer these inquiries about REA?

The one great problem, as far as agriculture is concerned, is that of maintaining parity prices for our farm commodities. All other agricultural problems sink into insignificance in comparison with that of assuring a fair and equitable price for what the farmers produce. I believe that the majority of the farmers of America will agree with me—one of these farmers—that payments need not be made to them in order to make sure that our soil will be properly conserved. The average farmer is interested enough in his own farm and in his own soil to be willing to keep that soil up by the application of proper fertilizers, provided he receives sufficient money from the sale of his commodities to be able to do so. I am also satisfied that the majority of the farmers of the Nation resent the criticism leveled at agriculture in general at the acceptance of any subsidy whatsoever. We have been forced at times in the past to come to the Treasury for a portion of a fair price for our products which we should have received in the market. Triple A payments, as made the past few years, are vastly different from what were known formerly as parity payments, which were made to the farmers of this Nation for the purpose of assuring to them at least 90 percent of parity for what they had to sell. The so-called triple A payments, in my opinion, do not come within this same category, and I, as one of the recipients of thse payments, believe that our Treasury needs this money today more than does the farmer. In line with this belief, I personally made the motion in subcommittee, which was adopted, to allot only $150,000,000 to triple A for 1947 payments instead of the $267,000,000 provided in the budget request. Further action by the subcommittee provides that there will be no triple A payments in 1948, and for the first time in many years our farmers will be strictly on their own.

I am disappointed, however, in the fact that the subcommittee and the full committee have seen fit to allow only $15,000,000 for the total of administrative expenses with which to take care of the National, State, county, and township operation of the entire triple-A structure. We need and must have the triple A county and township committees, through which to take care of our sealing programs, and we will not be able to do that with a $15,000,000 appropriation. Let us keep in mind at this point that the national and State expenses for this work in 1947 were $8,871,868, while the expenses of the county associations were $20,039,088, a total of $28,910,956. In the proposal to limit this year the expenses of the entire triple-A structure to $15,000,000, we find that of this amount $1,950,000 is permitted to be expended for national and State expenses, while $13,050,000 is allowed the county associations. I do not quarrel with the decrease in expenditure in the national and State set-up, but I do feel that it is practically the beginning of the end for the triple A county and township committee set-up, when we propose to give them nearly $7,000,000 less than they had available in 1947.

Please keep in mind that there is practically the same amount of work involved in making out the proper forms and writing a check to Jim Jones whether he receives $150 for his portion or whether that portion is approximately $90. The same computations are necessary, and I sincerely hope that the House will see fit to adopt an amendment restoring the $7,000,000 for this purpose.

The average farmer throughout the Nation knows just how badly we may need the county and township committees in the future to take care of our price-support programs as the various emergencies arise, and I feel sure that this same average farmer will agree with me that it would be far better to take an additional $7,000,000 allotted for individual payments to farmers and give this additional $7,000,000 to the county and township committees instead with which to do a good job. Unless these committees are available when needed, chaos can easily enter the agricultural picture and cost the Nation many times over the amount needed to keep these committees functioning.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention when we come to the proper paragraph of this bill to again offer a similar amendment to that which was defeated in the full committee only by a tie vote of 16 to 16. If there is any item in this bill in which I personally feel that our committee is in error, it is in this reduction of the administrative expenses for the triple A committee structure. Let us keep these committees, even at the expense of whittling down the payments to the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, it would require too much time to discuss the several changes that could be made in this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and I both feel that there is too much of what we might term departmental personnel left in this measure. In accordance with that belief, I personally had inserted in the report supplementary views as follows:

I have concurred in the majority report with the following reservations:

A major portion of the cuts effected have been obtained through the reduction in appropriations for AAA, the school-lunch program, and the Farm Home Administration, together with reductions of a lesser degree in REA, Research, Forestry, and other branches

I do not feel that proportionate cuts in personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture have been made consistent with those above mentioned.

It is my intention to offer on the floor, after careful study, certain amendments designed to secure the balance which is desirable.

May I point out that the American Farm Bureau Federation have issued a letter today in which they back me up in this opinion that the cuts in personnel have not been deep enough. Let us glance at one or two for example:

The immediate office of the Secretary has been allotted by the committee $18,350 more than it had available in the year 1947. It does seem to me that it should not be necessary for the Secretary's immediate office to expend $2,137,560, and it is my intention to later offer an amendment which would reduce this to somewhat in line with the other cuts which have been made in this bill upon the farmers of the Nation.

May we also glance at the Office of the Solicitor, which has been allocated in this bill $2,561,000, a decrease of only $54,000 under that available in 1947. When we consider, Mr. Chairman, the vast lessening of the various programs in the Department through this bill, it would seem that the work of the Office of the Solicitor would also become greatly lessened, and there is no reason in my opinion for an appropriation to the Solicitor's Office of more than $2,000,000. This cut of $561,000, which I propose to offer as an amendment, will do much toward leveling off the cuts as they should be in the Department of Agriculture.

I might state that my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DIRKSEN], suggested at least inferentially that a 20-percent reduction in personnel in the Office of the Secretary might well be made. This suggestion as to a 20-percent reduction in personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture has been advocated by the American Farm Bureau Federation, and I believe that that recommendation is very sound.

We have noted the past few days in the press of the Nation, declarations of the sighs of relief that obtained in the Department of Agriculture at the smallness of the cuts in personnel. Too much of the economy in this bill is at the expense of others than the employees of the Department of Agriculture. We see evidence throughout the bill, as we do in every appropriation measure, that hundreds upon hundreds of personnel have been upgraded 1, 2, and 3 positions, until we have arrived at the point where we have all corporals, sergeants, lieutenants and others, with practically no privates to do the work. That should be changed.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that the House will seriously consider the various amendments that will be offered in order that we might secure a better balanced bill. The farmers of America are willing to do their part in accepting these slashes as made and which we were compelled to make in the interest of economy. Is it asking to too much, Mr. Chairman, that the governmental employees in this vast bureaucratic structure known as the Department of Agriculture shall take a similar reduction in behalf of a firm, stable economy in this great United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is an easy role, of course, to appear as a critic and I hope while I shall differ vigorously with the committee in some of its findings that some of the more constructive aspects of what I say will not be overlooked, for I realize the committee has had a difficult job and the fact that some of us entertain strong views of disagreement does not mean that we are lacking in appreciation of the hard work that the committee has done. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak primarily of the work of the Farmers Home Administration. I do this not to exalt the activities of the administrative group any more than the contribution which the Congress has made in the fundamental law pertaining to the farm tenancy program.

I want to talk about the little farmer, I want to talk about the veterans, and I want to be entirely fair with those who have seen fit by committee action to reduce the appropriations for the little farmer and for the veteran who is a little farmer. I am sure that no Member of this House means to be unfair to the veteran, and sometimes, unconsciously perhaps, we hit below the belt as we plead for the veteran. I would like to disclaim that, and as I have said in other debates in the House, I realize that the veterans' interest are tied to other interests. If he is a farmer, to the interest of the agricultural population in general. If he is a part of the business community, his interests are tied generally to those of the business community. I am aware of that. But here in FHA is a specific program that is being channeled for the farm youth who went to war and came back seeking an opportunity to reestablish himself on the land.

Here is a program that is being greatly jeopardized by the action of the committee in cutting out all of the appropriations for the tenant-purchase program, reducing the administrative fund for the Farmers Home Corporation from $25,000,000 to $18,000,000, and reducing the rehabilitation loans and emergency crop loans, as we used to call them—they have been combined—from $90,000,000 to $60,000,000. It simply cannot be justified if I properly interpret the testimony of the agency officials and the comments that were made by the members of the committee as they heard Mr. Dillard Lassiter and his associates.

Let us go back briefly to the history of the Farmers Home Administration. Every man who knows Marvin Jones respects him. I think that one of the finest monuments to any legislator is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and it is proving itself. I am speaking now of the tenant purchase program. It is necessary to distinguish between the two phases of the Farmers Home Administration program, the rehabilitation loans and the tenant purchase loans or the ownership program.

Speaking now of the tenant purchase program I must pay tribute to our former Member, Marvin Jones, who insisted, when the legislation was being evolved, upon two things: One was that it be anchored to the locality; that a county committee be designated to pass upon the soundness of the loans, and his wisdom in that respect has been amply demonstrated. One reason that the program is working out is that a committee of farmers acquainted with land values has passed upon the soundness of every loan. The second is the standard of personal experience and fitness. The applicant as well as the land must pass muster.

Our Government, in inaugurating the farm tenancy program, had few examples in other countries to help us. There was one pattern, and that was in Denmark, where in one generation the tenancy ratio went down from 90 percent to less than 10 percent, but the Danes had a rather restricted experience. They were engaged largely in dairying, and we have in addition to our great dairy industry, of course, many other types to be considered. But we paralleled Denmark's policy of liberal credit for the purchase of farms so that increasing numbers of American farmers might be able to say, "This is my own vine and fig tree," and as the prophet said, "There shall be none to make him afraid." So the law prescribed that loans should be for 40 years, for 100 percent of the value, and at 3-percent interest.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to make this observation, that while we are making these reductions under this appropriation act, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill over in the other body has been under consideration which provided in section 10 an appropriation of $25,000,000 for rural housing for the first year of its operation. I understand that that bill will not come up on the floor and that we will not have an increase of appropriations to carry out a rural housing program.

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to have the gentleman's comment. Incidentally, speaking of the housing program, it is true—and this is not a partisan statement since it involves a program begun by a Democratic administration—but it is true that over a period of years there has been more spent in Federal funds, for housing in single cities than in rural housing in the whole United States, and yet if this appropriation measure stands unamended, you are going to strike out of the bill something that is proving its soundness, without any doubt, and the figures are in this record submitted by the Farmers' Home Administration.

Let me get back to the figures. I refer to the tenancy program. What happened? You have loaned under the Bankhead-Jones Act the sum of $282,000,000, with only a $50,000 loss. Now, you cannot find anywhere in the governmental enterprise of noncommer-

cial credit anything that is comparable to that, and yet you propose to strike it out.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not also true that those in the low-income groups in the cities received subsidies that were many, many times greater than the subsidies that were paid to these farmers?

Mr. HAYS. Exactly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Extending over many years.

Mr. HAYS. Right. There is no element of subsidy here. These men have gone out on the land and by hard work have proved their right to a stake in it, and they are making good. No one is going to stand on this floor and question this basic conclusion, and I submit that we ought not to interrupt this program. It has vast economic and social implications. I just cannot believe that the committee intends to interrupt it permanently. Then why lose this valuable time? I believe my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] thinks well of the record. I believe that he is proud of the Bankhead-Jones program. It undertakes to reduce the frightening percentage of farm tenancy in this country so that we can get it well below the 50-percent mark, where it was once, to a proper percentage throughout America.

I am not making any sweeping claims for farm ownership. I realize that in a country with diversified interests there will be an element of tenancy, that in some situations the renter relationship is wholesome and economically sound. It is not that I expect all farms to be owner-operated. I realize it cannot be done. I am saying—and this justifies my allusion to the early history of the Bankhead-Jones Act—that it was a dangerous situation that called for the enactment of this law, and I do not want us to take a backward step.

Now about the veteran. These young farmers have come back, a million of them. A survey of the Army at one time showed 650,000 of them, when they were asked, "What do you want when the war is over in the way of an economic opportunity?" saying, "A chance on the land."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. These young men came back, some of them 4-H Club gradutes, some of them agricultural students. We are spending now under the GI bill of rights millions of dollars to equip them through vocational training for farming pursuits, yet we would say by this action that they are not to have the credit that is necessary to enable them to utilize to a maximum degree the capabilities developed by the GI program.

We are not stopping the GI loans for the city veteran. I regret to make this reference, but we are going right ahead with business loans. If the veteran wants a radio shop he gets a loan, and if he wants to finance a new business he gets a loan, but the committee says that he cannot have a farm, not now, under this beneficent program.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Possibly the only thing we have to offer in that connection is the Cunningham bill, that has been in the hopper for several weeks now. I do not remember all its provisions, but as I recall, it conforms to the Bankhead-Jones provisions. It applies only to veterans, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He has helped me very much by these references. But no law will help if appropriations are withheld.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. A study of rural-population indexes shows that today the per capita acreage is increasing, that is, the large farm is getting larger as time goes on, and we are not making proper inducements to the small-farm operator.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I am glad to have that pointed out. That undoubtedly is the trend.

I anticipate that the committee will say that they do not want to encourage land inflation. That is in the report. I recognize that danger. I agree that we would be unfair to some applicants to say, "Here is a loan, buy the farm." I realize that. Certainly we ought to give every encouragement to the measures that are being advanced for stopping the spiral in land prices. But the records show that the Farmers' Home Administration has avoided that misfortune. There has been an increase in their loans of only $13 a farm. They are handling the problem in a very effective way, by cutting out every element of speculation, and by full use of their facilities for land appraisals.

The War Assets Administration will ultimately release 3,000,000 acres of agricultural lands as surplus war property. Much of this land should be sold to eligible farm veterans. We should not deprive them of adequate credit facilities. There are other sources of farm land and under the tenant-purchase program it can be made available at terms which assure success.

The FHA's success has attracted the veterans who wish to engage in farming. On April 30, 41,000 of them had applications on file. To meet this situation nonveteran loans were suspended in 26 States. The agency has had a larger volume of applications for operating loans, approximately 150,000 this year, 48,000 from veterans. If the appropriation is not increased, virtually no additional production loans can be processed.

Now, I believe that the Members give the Administrator, Mr. Lasseter, credit for a good performance. He is following legislative policy closely in one of the most difficult jobs in the Department of Agriculture.

The Congress should not handicap the agency in its vital function. I, therefore hope the appropriations can be restored, as contemplated by the Bankhead-Jones Act and the Cooley Act.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the action of the subcommittee in this bill is deplorable. They have broken faith with the American farmer. I realize that reductions must be made in expenditures. Many millions of dollars have been cut off appropriations this year, and I have subscribed to most of them. I feel that cuts were in order in the Agriculture Department, because certainly there are duplications which exist throughout the Department. A careful review of this bill, however, discloses that the cuts are made in funds and there are no requirements that the reductions be applied to eliminate duplications. In fact I find nothing that would prevent the Department from keeping the high-priced administrative and supervisory personnel and applying the cuts to the jobs of those in the local and county levels, which actually render the service. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the cuts in this bill are cuts in services to the farmer and not cuts in cost of service. In several regards this bill absolutely breaks faith with the American farmers.

During the war the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture urged the American farmer to plant every available acre to increase the food supplies of not only the United States but of other countries of the world. The American farmer heeded that call and has planted many acres which, under good farm practices, would have been better had they not been planted. In so doing the natural resources have been depleted. Recognizing that situation, the Congress for some years past has provided for soil-conservation payments, Thus payments are not, as some describe, outright payments to the farmers or gifts from his Government, but they are made if the farmer himself will spend for each dollar of Federal payment $2 out of his own pocket for the protection of the fertility of the soil. In other words, if the farmer spends $3 out of his own pocket to protect this land, the Federal Government has paid $1 on the basis that the Federal Government, and those to come after us, have an interest in this great natural resource—our soil.

I believe this is a good program but whether it is a good program or not, insofar as this appropriation bill is concerned, we made an outright commitment to the American farmer last year when this bill was brought up because Judge Tarver, of Georgia, offered an amendment which fixed this program at $300,000,000 for this calendar year, funds for which must be included in this bill. Judge Tarver at that time was chairman of this committee. He stated that he was offering the amendment so that it could not be misunderstood or so there would be no mistake in the matter. The Secretary of Agriculture announced such program after the bill of last year became the law. The various AAA offices of the States, of the counties and communities announced programs based

on such figures. Action has already been taken. The programs have been acted upon, the farmers have done their part, and now when this committee reduces such appropriation almost in half it is breaking a commitment which has been entered into and on which the American farmers have relied. Mr. Chairman, although I did not share in the opinion, I recall in recent weeks when Members of the Congress, including those on the Republican side of the aisle, advocated supplying to Russia certain lend-lease materials and certain industrial plants, even though Russia had failed in many instances to carry out her agreements, all because they contended we had made a commitment. But here today we find many of that same crowd recommending that we break our commitment to the American farmer, who has fulfilled his agreement 100 percent.

I believe that this type of program should be greatly reduced. The demands for food and for working every available acre, it is to be hoped, will let up in the next few years. This program should be tapered off, farmers will learn the value of protecting the soil themselves and have done so, but certainly insofar as this year is concerned we are obligated to carry out our commitment.

A study of this bill shows that the administrative expenses of the REA have been reduced approximately one-third. We all know that through the war practically no expansion of this system was made. The war effort required so many of the materials that all of us in Congress have had to write many letters advising that materials and equipment were unavailable to provide such extensions. Each time I had to write such a letter I realized it was deplorable that this was the condition, because I know, Mr. Chairman, that nothing could be more helpful to farm life and farm people than to see that electricity is available in the home and about the farm. Now that the war is over and plans are being made to expand the REA lines, now that the local directors would have the opportunity to expand their systems and carry this splendid service to thousands of other farmers, we find this committee, or the majority of this committee, coming in with the report which will seriously cripple the operations of the REA. We all know that when an application is made from a local REA it must be processed by the National Administration. We know that the office here must supply engineering advice and must help in securing supplies. We are almost altogether dependent upon the REA office to see to it that the new lines are placed on an area basis so that in the future still additional lines may be extended so that eventually all farms may have the benefit of cheap electricity. Certainly, the Republican members of this committee are going to have the responsibility for keeping thousands of these farm homes from having electricity, but it is still more important these farm families living in those homes will not have the benefit of this great program to make their lot a little easier, their lives a little brighter. I believe that by all means this committee today should adopt an amendment replacing this administrative fund so that the Rural Electrification Administration can put on full steam and expand this system just as rapidly as possible.

Also, I notice from this bill that the Republican members of the committee have provided for the repeal of section 32 funds. These section 32 funds are made available under the act of 1935 as amended, wherein 30 percent of the customs revenue from competitive agricultural products brought into this country shall be set aside for the use of the Department of Agriculture to assist in the support of American grown agricultural products and in their utilization. Over the last 10-year period these funds, which under the basic law belong to Agriculture, have served to bale out the wheat farmer, the poultry farmer, the fruit grower, the corn farmer and the cotton farmer. To take away these funds now is in effect to repeal one of the great substantive laws which has kept agriculture on an even basis with other industries. I certainly hope that this House will review the action of the majority of this committee and strike out this effort to repeal section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This report also strikes out all tenant purchase loans, all land purchases under the Farmers Home Administration. This organization has outstanding over $800,000,000 in loans now, and administrative funds are reduced to the extent that it is my information that the losses may run as high as $50,000,000 for lack of provision under the bill to handle outstanding loans. The entire land purchase program is stricken from the bill. This means that the veterans, 35,000 of them, whose applications are now being processed will have no opportunity for a year at least to become home owners, yet funds were made available and other citizens were permitted to buy through the years that these boys were in the service and now that they are back and want to buy, this committee says no funds shall be made available.

This bill fails in another particular, Mr. Chairman. We all recall that just a few years ago we were burdened with great surpluses of agricultural products. While today practically everything that is grown can be utilized either here or abroad, in just a few years we know that surpluses will again trouble us. We will have too much corn, too much wheat, too much cotton, and the Commodity Credit Corporation Act provides that the Federal Government guarantees either to purchase or to lend up to 90 percent of parity on such products. Thus we can easily see that it is highly desirable that every effort be made to fully utilize these surpluses in agriculture products, because to utilize them will be to prevent the Federal Government from having to purchase or lend money on them and in the long run will be cheaper.

We know the value of research, we have seen it in hybrid corn, we have seen it in the improved cotton seed, and in practically every phase of agriculture. Under the Hope-Flanagan bill, providing for research and utilization and marketing of agricultural products, $19,000,000 was provided for the next fiscal year. Yet this committee, after first refusing to make any appropriation, has recommended only $6,000,000. It is my judgment that this sum should be increased to at least $9,500,000 because each dollar spent in research and utilization of agricultural products will probably save many times that much in causing such products to be used the coming year and in keeping it out of the category of surplus.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to point out wherein this bill is very destructive. As I stated at the outset, one of the greatest disappointments in this bill is in the fact that it does not cut out duplications and does not require the reduction in personnel in the national and district offices as it should. I am sure that the Department will reduce personnel due to the fact that funds are simply not available, but there is nothing in the bill which will prevent the Department from applying the cuts in the field and to the employee at the local level who actually renders the service to the farmers, and retain the high-priced supervisory personnel. No, Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to reductions in appropriation, but I think they should be applied in the right place and in such way as to cut out duplication. The American farmer is not receiving too much service. The cost of the service that he does get is too great and it is there that these reductions should have been made. I think that one little thing in this bill will indicate what the Republican majority has had in mind. The Secretary of Agriculture is getting a new limousine, but the American farmer is getting 50 percent reduction in service in the payments which he has earned under an outright contract between his Government and himself. The Republicans have a majority of the votes in the Congress, but certainly they will make a serious mistake not to accept the amendments which will be offered by our party to correct the tragic provisions of this bill, which I have pointed out. A more patriotic, hard-working group than the American farmer does not exist. Certainly, I for one expect to keep faith with him.

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, most of us from agricultural districts are greatly disappointed in this bill. I think every Member of the House who represents an agricultural district knows that.

Our farmers have probably reached the most stable basis in American agriculture. We have made great progress. We have made progress when it comes to conserving our soil. We have made progress in improving our pastures. We have made progress in greater yields per acre. We are rotating crops, terracing lands, conserving soils, reforesting marginal lands, dredging low lands, and making the greatest progress in our history. I think it can be said without any fear of successful contradiction that American agriculture now is upon the

firmest foundation in American history. But along comes this bill. I do not want any mistake made about it. I have never indulged in partisan policies on this floor, but I want the farmers to know and I want the country to know that this is a Republican bill. It is the product of Republican brains, and I think that some of our friends on the left who can now take full credit for it, should pause to think. The farmers are going to know what political party is responsible for this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield briefly.

Mr. GROSS. It may be a Republican bill or any other bill, but I am going to support it because it is going to save thousands of GI's from going into bankruptcy, due to the reckless loaning of money to the GI's by a Government that is just a do-good outfit.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for a speech. I have the gentleman's statement and I am not surprised at his going along with his Republican leaders in supporting this bill to cut the American farmers. The gentleman usually goes along with his party.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have time to discuss everything in the bill that I would like to discuss, but there are some cuts in the bill that are so hurtful, some cuts in this bill that stick out like a sore thumb, that I am constrained to devote my short time to those matters.

Of course, the bill as a whole, if we might use Shakespeare's language, "is the most unkindest cut of all." I do not know of a single agency in the Federal Government that has suffered so much at the hands of this Republican-controlled Congress as the Department of Agriculture. I know of no group that has suffered so much and will suffer so greatly as the man between the plow handles, as the result of this bill. Why should this happen to the farmers? As one who was born and reared on a farm and who now lives on a farm, I protest the treatment of the farmer by the Republican leadership in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, under the question of soil conservation, they have cut the item for soil conservation research—that is something that every man who is interested in the United States should be interested in, every man in the city ought to be interested in, planning to make this country greater, agriculturally speaking—and to do that we ought not cut out the very vital element of research. We must have knowledge. It is the foundation of our great agricultural progress. Our new knowledge has contributed to the bountiful crops we now have—great crops—great yields—national agricultural security. Yet this great subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress has seen fit to cut this item, not by 10 percent or 20 percent or 30 percent, but by 52 percent.

I have read the report. I know the philosophy under which the committee, or perhaps I should say the distinguished chairman, the affable gentleman from Illinois cut this item. But I disagree with the committee and with the chairman in this. We must continue to have research and experimentation for our farmers just as we have in other phases of vital American life. This cut of 52 percent is too deep, to say the least.

In the Conservation Service, in the Soil Conservation Service, they have made a cut of 12½ percent, but that cut is based upon the number of soil-conservation districts we had last year. If you consider the number of districts, 1,838, which we had at the time of the writing of the bill last year, it is a cut of 12½ percent, but we have 200 more districts now and the districts are now increasing at the rate of about 20 a month. I am informed that if you take into consideration the districts as they now stand the cut is about 22 percent. That means a lack of personnel out in the field. I believe in economy, but if you are going to cut out the man who goes out to the farm to help the farmer, goes out and helps the one-gallus farmers, what can you expect in this country? The field personnel help in many farm programs and this cut means less help for the farmer. I do not like that cut.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to talk very briefly about another cut in this bill which is very bad. In 1946 when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Tarver, took this floor and offered his amendment to fix the triple A payments or soil conservation payments at $300,000,000, it was adopted in this House overwhelmingly. The gentleman from Georgia then, as is revealed by the record, put the House on notice that it was establishing a precedent, that it was establishing a fixed sum and he warned the House that if they did not want to do that then was the time to vote against it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It goes even further. It goes so far as to fix it by statutory law. It becomes law.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is just what I am getting to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Very briefly.

Mr. GORE. And when the Congress took that action it made a commitment with the farmers of the country. Following that action the programs have been signed, the farmers have entered into the operation of the program, yet now we are breaking faith, we are reneging on that contract.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. That is what I was just coming to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; my time is short; I yielded to the gentleman once, and I ask him please to let me continue with my remarks.

At that time Mr. Tarver, in presenting his amendment, said this:

> Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago; that is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.
>
> But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicitly so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the gentleman from Georgia said in submitting the amendment and it is written into the act. We Democrats consider this a solemn obligation of the Government of the United States. Acting upon that, allocations were made to the various States. An allocation was made to the State of Louisiana and all others and that allocation, that money, in the various States has already been largely allocated and taken up in effect in the numerous States. In the State of Louisiana on April 30 there had been allocated of its allotment 69 percent.

What are we going to do? Along comes this committee, speaking for the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress, and says, "We know in effect that the Congress did that, but one Congress cannot bind another Congress." There is no disputing the fact that one Congress cannot bind another Congress, but, Mr. Chairman, one Congress can write a solemn commitment and we on this side of the aisle take the view that this was a commitment and we want and urge this Congress to live up to it.

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do? What is the American farmer going to expect in the future? What can the American farmer rely on? The Republican leadership has gone back on this 1946 amendment and declines to give the American farmer this fund which we think the last Congress practically committed. We take the position that this is an obligation, a commitment

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that in each and every contract signed up this spring there is a clause that the carrying out of the contract by the Government depends upon the action of the Congress in making the funds available?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Every farmer, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota, knows that all these payments depend upon the money being appropriated by the Congress of the United States; but every farmer expects the Congress of the United States to live up to its commitments, even if the Republicans are running Congress. Do not forget that there are Republican farmers relying on this also, and if this money is not made available to them they should know who is doing it to them.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had time to go ahead and discuss briefly other things. The school-lunch program has been cut

from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. That goes into the stomachs of the poor children out in the country. You have seen fit to cut it. Oh, yes, you can vote to send things to Europe, but some of you cannot vote to fill the stomachs of the poor hungry child. I hope you will vote to correct this situation and provide funds for these school lunches.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There were recorded here the other day only 86 votes against sending $350,000,000 more to Europe.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is right, and most of the gentlemen on the right and the left voted for it.

Now, I want to discuss something else here very briefly in conclusion, and that is section 32 funds. More than 10 years ago this Congress went on record and arranged through our imports to get a certain fund. Everybody in this House knows about it. That fund was also solemnly dedicated, but we have seen the spectacle in this House in the good year of 1947 that this august body voted in effect a few minutes ago and probably will vote again later, because you have the votes to do it with and we recognize that to take section 32 funds from the farmer entirely. We recognize the fact that the Republican steam roller is rolling along smoothly and it will probably roll along smoothly on this bill. But, you have seen fit to cut that fund out. You have seen fit to take that fund from the great American farmer, and you have got the votes to do it with. Gentlemen, that is the farmer's money. That is a sort of sacred fund. That fund has a solemn dedication, and we have throughout the years recognized that. The Democratic Congresses never wavered from the commitments of 1935, but here in this good time of 1947 it is being snatched away, ruthlessly taken away from the American farmers. I do not think that our farmers are going to like that. Even Republican farmers are not going to like that.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer who gets up before daylight and works into the night, I do not think that the young men coming back from the armed services who helped to win this war and who are going back to the farms and who have to work early and late as I did back there, I do not think that they are going to like it and I plead with you not to do this. The late Senator Borah, a great Republican, I understand offered the amendment for the section 32 funds, and yet in 1947 under the leadership of his party, the great work of Borah is stricken down.

I plead that we may forget partisanship and stand by our farmers, North, South, East, and West. This is a national problem. Agriculture must be sustained. Let us note on both sides of the aisle to restore these funds to the American farmer.

I appeal to this House to rectify this great injustice to producing America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it can be successfully disputed that the Federal Government has wasted billions of dollars in the past 10 to 15 years. It cannot be disputed that a great deal of money has been spent unnecessarily. It is certainly time that this Government should about face and economize wherever possible, in order that the heavy tax burden now being borne by the American people be reduced, and in order that the tremendous public debt of approximately $260,000,000,000 be reduced as rapidly as possible.

I expect to cooperate with economy-minded representatives in Congress, to that end, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. I firmly believe that governmental expenditures should be sharply curtailed, that taxes should be reduced as rapidly as possible, and that the public debt should be reduced as rapidly as possible.

I do not believe, however, that this appropriation bill which we are considering today should pass as it has been reported out by the Appropriations Committee. Before we vote on this very important measure, I want to call to the attention of the committee and of the House, that, at the present rate of soil erosion, about one hundred and seven million acres, or approximately 25 percent of our farm land, is deteriorating rapidly. That is to say, the fertility of our soil and the top soil itself, is being depleted by the growth of soil-depleting crops and by erosion caused by rainfall and dust storms. The experts who make it their business to know the facts concerning soil depletion and soil erosion, state that unless this approximately one-fourth of our crop land is treated within the next 13 years—by 1960—it will be irreparably damaged, and that it will be too late to take remedial steps after 1960 for this one-fourth portion of our crop land.

In addition to that, there is another portion of our cropland which is rapidly eroding. More than 110,000,000 acres of our cropland is eroding in such a serious way that its productive capacity will be permanently impaired unless that acreage is treated within 23 years from this time—by 1970.

In the first part of April this year, because of the fact that I realized that the preservation of our top soil and our productive cropland is of vital importance to all of us, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to give me a report of croplands which would show the rate per annum at which our soil resources are being depleted, and which would show whether the rate of depletion is decreasing or increasing, comparing the present-day rate with the rate 10 years ago, and 25 years ago. On May 1, 1947, I was furnished this report. It shows that the rate of depletion by erosion on unprotected land is increasing with every year of use. It shows on conservation-protected land, an entirely different situation; that is, that on conservation-protected land, the rate of depletion is decreasing rapidly, and there is little, if any, loss of soil from such land for such time as the protection is maintained. This report shows, however, that approximately 90 percent of the farm land which is subject to erosion, is still without adequate protection.

For the country as a whole, then, the total depletion is reduced as the acreage of completely treated land is increased. This report shows that the rate of erosion is increasing, but the area in which erosion is taking place is being reduced as the conservation treatment progresses. This reduction of area in which erosion is taking place has been due in large measure to the soil-conservation program of the Agriculture Department of our Government.

The report which I mentioned above gives the further important information that about 500,000 acres of former crop land is being ruined each year as the result of erosion, and is rendered useless for any further practical cultivation. Surely these facts are sufficient to impress thinking people with the fact that a continuation of the conservation program of our Department of Agriculture is very necessary.

I believe that this report which was furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, is conservative. I believe that it is reliable. I do not believe that it is exaggerated. I asked for it so that I might have the facts to make up my own mind when the question of continuing this soil conservation program came up in the House. The financing of this soil conservation program, in my opinion, is an instance of money well spent by the Government.

In the time allotted to me, I cannot, of course, begin to cover the many items contained in this appropriation bill. There is one other item, however, which I wish to discuss more or less briefly. That is the school-lunch program.

Again I wish to state that I expect to cooperate with all those who want to run the Government economically. But if an item is appropriate for Government financing, why not finance it adequately? This is not an issue that ought to be staddled. Either the school-lunch program is a good program or it is a bad program.

The Appropriations Committee, by their action in setting up $45,000,000 for the school-lunch program, has endorsed it, and given it the committee's approval. Forty-five million dollars, however, is not enough to finance the program for the coming school year. Seventy-five million dollars is the amount needed. Even with $75,000,000 appropriated for the school year which ends June 30, 1947, we still lacked $6,000,000 of completely financing the program for this current school year. It was necessary to go through a battle on the floor of the House on April 1 to get this additional $6,000,000 to carry the program through the school year. If we are going to finance the program, why not finance it at one time and eliminate all the hurly-burly and scurrying around and fighting on the floor of the House between those who favor the program and

those who oppose it, as we had to do on April 1 to get this little deficiency balance?

How is it consistent to vote for forty-five million and refuse to vote for $75,000,000?

I do not think it is necessary to reiterate and argue here that this school-lunch program means better health for school children through defeating malnutrition. There are many children throughout the United States who do not receive balanced meals at home, but who through the school-lunch program have been able to receive one complete, balanced meal per day. This means a great improvement in health. It means that the general health and well-being of the children have improved, and that the children actually make better grades when they receive this balanced lunch at school. The improvement in their physical condition will go with them throughout their entire lives.

In this connection, I cannot help remembering one of the first speeches I heard here when I became a Member of Congress in January. I well remember that on January 8, which was the third day the House held sessions at the present term, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the subcommittee which brought out the present bill, took the floor of the House and made quite a lengthy speech, calling the attention of the Members of the House to the very large proporation of young men examined for military service who were found unfit physically. He gave the actual figures and the percentages in every State in the Union and this can be found on page 196 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of January 8, 1947. The percentage of young men rejected for military service because of physical unfitness ranged from 23.1 percent in Utah, which was the lowest, to 44.2 percent in South Carolina, which was the highest. In the gentleman's speech he pointed out that the principal causes for rejection were eye defects, defective teeth, defective feet, and heart ailments.

It is well known that a proper, balanced diet is a great contributing factor to good eyesight, good teeth, good bones, and robust physical development. On January 8 the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was greatly concerned about the physical fitness of our young men for military service. We should be greatly concerned now about the physical fitness of our young people. It is of the utmost importance to our future security that our young men and young women should be strong, healthy, and physically fit. One of the cheapest and most effective ways in which we can assure this physical fitness is to provide them the proper food which they will get through this school-lunch program, which, in the long run, is money well spent and money well applied.

I especially call the attention of the committee in the House to the analysis of funds for the national school-lunch program, as submitted by State educational agencies, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 17, 1947, by Senator AIKEN. This table shows that the school-lunch program is welcomed throughout the United States, including the District of Columbia. The children of Illinois, the home State of the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee reporting this appropriation bill out, have written letters to me asking me to support the school-lunch program. I have had similar requests from many sections of the United States. In this analysis of funds on page 1117 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is given a complete tabulation of the amounts allotted to each State. It is something every Member should read and study.

How can we refuse to continue this program on an adequate basis, in the face of the fact that we are sending hundreds of millions of dollars all over the face of the earth, that we are subsidizing users of the mail by paying a part of their postage expense, that we are subsidizing ocean traffic, air traffic, and other items considered to be in the national interests?

I have heard it said by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York, that the States have plenty of money and ought to finance this program themselves. On one occasion, at the very time this contention was being made by the gentleman from New York, a strike of school teachers was going on in the gentleman's own home State, which in itself indicates that the State was not financing its school program, and I presume because of lack of funds. Certainly they would not refuse to pay the teachers if they had the money. We cannot insist that money be taken from funds needed for school teachers' salaries and apply it to the financing of a school-lunch program. No one wants the school teachers to pay for the school-lunch program, which that would mean.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minues to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have very great confidence in the farmers of America. It would seem that I have a greater confidence than the gentleman who preceded me, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman from California feel that the average farmer in America wants to do his share toward helping to balance the budget of this great Nation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. From the days of Cato when he spoke of the farm population as being the safest, the population most to be trusted, and the population less given to intrigue, I think we have found in every emergency and especially in the history of this Nation, that the solution of that emergency and the strength to meet the emergency have come primarily from the rural areas of America.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman feel that we on this subcommittee or we in Congress would be doing anybody, whether he be a veteran or a nonveteran, a favor by helping him to buy farm lands today which are inflated out of sight above their true value? It would simply mean that that particular man would go broke in a few years. I certainly cannot see where we have done anything but justice in eliminating entirely the farm-tenancy program for the present. We will restore these loans when land prices moderate in value.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Translated into the simple language of the gentleman from Minnesota there is no answer but "No." I agree. I do not think this House at any time desires to appropriate less money than is needed for the essential agricultural requirements of America, nor does it wish to appropriate any money which would be disadvantageous to the veterans, to the young men, or to the farmers.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. My reading of the record did not reflect that there was any testimony offered to the committee to the effect that the Bankhead-Jones loans are adding at all to the inflationary influences in this country at the present time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that very briefly?

The evidence before the committee was that the prices of farms, such as those desired by the young men who would ask for a 100-percent loan, had risen to a point where a break in price or a recession was about to occur. There were in many areas of the United States definite evidences of people anxious to sell their farms, anxious to sell them under the terms of these 100-percent loans, because by that means Uncle Sam would be assuming the burden and they would be out from under, and would have loaded them upon the shoulders of the veterans before the recession went any further. That was very definitely before the committee and had, I think, the largest influence in removing that particular fund until this committee, and until the whole Congress, could see just what situation develops. I think the gentleman from Arkansas will agree with me that in the past this House has never been niggardly toward the veterans or toward the younger farmers under any of the acts passed by this House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall the President's statement last week which had a great influence on the subcommittee in revising their estimates on this particular item.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman from Arkansas is familiar with that statement by the President of the United States that we are in a dangerous period for the purchase of farms, and that did influence the committee.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I as two members of the subcommittee which brought the bill to the floor and two of the members of that committee who represent districts which are almost entirely agricultural, have added to the subcommittee report

what might be called minority reports. They are not minority reports in the sense that we opposed the other members of the committee. They are additional views, in which both of us separately have said that in our opinion this bill is not cut as much as it could be. Remember that we speak for farmers, we speak for men and women who went to the polls in November and said that they wanted a sound economy, that they wanted a balanced budget, and that they felt that if we are to support the entire world in a style to which that world hopes to become accustomed, it is better for all of us, including the farmers themselves, to do it with sound money and with a balanced budget.

We have here another one of the great rambling agencies of Government, with no deliberate desire to grow, but simply growing through the requests of the farmers of America, from a small agency to one which now covers acres of ground and employs 70,000 people.

So, I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota who has already spoken, that there are many places in this bill where further cuts could have been made.

It is not my desire to talk about the whole bill. I would like to pay my respects as the newest member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture to the chairman and to the other members who did a tremendously hard job. It is not easy to cut a bill. It is very easy to appropriate money. It is tremendously hard to cut a bill and to cut it especially in matters with which you are so closely associated as all of us were.

So I thought I would take one or two of the items that are in the bill and say a little about them and suggest what might have been behind the cuts, in my mind at least, and in my vote in the subcommittee.

The AAA appropriation, that is, the payments to the farmers for doing things which most of them would have gladly done without the payments, and which they would have to do if they are to continue to be successful farmers, is one of the items now which comes up for discussion. It is said that we cut a great deal of money from that appropriation. I point out now that the Bureau of the Budget wished to apply $100,000,000 of section 32 funds to those payments, a transfer of funds with which the subcommittee was not entirely in favor. We actually took off that item about $117,000,000.

It has already been pointed out, before I came on the floor, that these payments could be divided into groups of certain sizes. There was some 63 percent of the total in checks of $60 or less; that is, the money total. They went, however, to only 22 percent of all the farmers who are receiving these payments. There was 17 percent in money total going to the farmers who received checks of from $60 to $100. There was, however, 19.31 percent, or less than 20 percent of the money, going to 60 percent of the farmers in checks of from $100 up.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and anyone who knows the farming situation, if you do not agree with me that practically all of these farmers would not only have made the same improvements or done the same work on their farms and that they would have done it without the payments from the Federal Government as quickly as they would have done it with the payments. I received a petition a year ago from one of my counties asking us to stop these payments, even though the signers were receiving them. I find it difficult to believe that the farmers themselves are doing the mourning which is heard upon the floor of this House today.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to an actual contract, which I hold in my hand, sent to me by the man and woman, joint owners of a farm, for whom it was filled out and to whom it was sent. He sent it to me saying that he hoped this could be cut out and would I please do all that I could to see it is eliminated.

I want to call the attention of the House today to the words printed in very plain type on the front of this contract at a place where they could not possibly be missed, if a farmer even looked at it casually, in readable type, and not in the proverbial fine type on the back of the contract which we joke about in insurance contracts. This is what it says:

> Payments under the 1947 agricultural conservation program are subject to the appropriation hereinafter made for this purpose by the Congress.

The committee decided that we could pay the people who would receive $50 less the full amount, those who would receive $100 three-quarters of the payments, and those who would receive from $100 to $500 half the amount, and those who would receive over $500 nothing at all, or up to a quarter of their amount. We certainly have fulfilled any obligation which might have been imposed, not by us but by the field representatives of the Department, for the smaller farmers of the United States who have been so emotionally spoken about today.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has read the language that was carried in the agreement. Inasmuch as similar language has been carried there for many years, and the Congress has consistently in past years met its obligation and appropriated the funds, just exactly how far does the gentleman think that his farmer and my farmer should go regarding that as something that deterred him from engaging in the practice himself? I would like to get the gentleman's practical experience from his contact with the men in the field.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If we may leave it as a practical proposition, it becomes a very easy question to answer. It is still a fact, whether the farmer read it this year or 2 years ago. If the farmer received a check in previous years, there was no reason for him to believe the statement was not a fact in the contract which he read this year. The only question is, are we to pay, in my opinion, the farmers with the larger incomes, the farmers who would receive from $100 up in checks—are we to pay them in full or not? I have expressed my opinion that I believe those farmers themselves, if a questionnaire was sent to them, would in great majority say that they would support the report of this committee.

Mr. PACE. If you could pay only one or the other?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes, if you could pay only one or the other. Does the gentleman think that the money should be divided among all? In which case it would be about 50 percent for all.

Mr. PACE. Well, I feel very deeply that the Congress should fulfill its obligation that we made last year and appropriate the funds we promised for the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I think, from all the farmers I have talked to, their reaction will be very favorable to an ending of the program, whether it comes abruptly in the middle of a payment season or whether we wait until the end and stop it then. I think most of the farmers will look upon it as a saving of $117,000,000.

I wanted to speak about the Research Act for which $19,000,000 was asked, and for which the committee appropriated $6,000,000. I was a member of the Legislative Committee while this was going through. I went home and, you might say, campaigned on the platform that the two outstanding acts of the Seventy-ninth Congress were the passage of the Research Act and the passage of the Reorganization Act. I came back and to my very intense disappointment found that the Department of Agriculture was not setting up a merchandising research section or bureau under the terms of the act, but was setting up a sort of an adjunct to the Production Research Act.

This discussion appears in the hearings. I have carried it on with representatives of the Department ever since, including the Secretary recently. I have here the most recent chart handed me by the Secretary showing the set-up. I will say very briefly that any organization in the Department of Agriculture which attempts to set up this merchandising research service so clearly outlined in the bill and in the report, by putting production research head over here, balancing the production marketing administration head over here, then showing under him, as one of the four subheads, the assistant administrator for marketing who is intended to be the man referred to in the Legislative Research Act, thus putting him where he is inferior in organization position, and not balancing this position, that certainly was not intended by the Legislative Committee as I understood the act at the time I was a member. I think the subcommittee was very generous in giving $6,000,000. I would have given $4,250,000 which was half of the first year's amount and then said to the Department that they could come back if they set up the agency as we asked them to set it up. I have repeatedly said that $19,000,000 would be a very small sum to pay for what the Legislative Committee wanted, but a very expensive sum to pay for what they are now getting in the present organization.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish the gentleman would explain to the House the effect of this cut and whether or not in time under this cut we will have a correlation of all the experimental work? What I am trying to get at is the difference between experimental work and research work.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There is very close correlation between production and marketing and research on both sides, and there has to be. For that reason the setting up of a coordinating office is very good.

In the past 10 years we have had our appropriations for marketing research absorbed in production research, and it was the desire of the legislative committee, I am positive, to set up a marketing or merchandising research program which could stand on its own feet, be identified, and the expenditures identified and coordinated. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin will agree that production research would benefit the farmers of the country at a time when, using a very familiar expression, it is really later than we think. We must build up production, the delivery of the produced food, from the farm to the consumer, as we have built up ability in the United States to produce beyond all other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. Let me proceed very briefly just to illustrate one of the little agencies in the Government which in my opinion has not been overly cut. We have a little office called the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Back in the days when I myself spent quite a bit of time with some of these men in Germany and France, and in other countries, we were giving the agency about $180,000 per year and it was very effective, it was a very good agency of the Department of Agriculture. The agency asked this year for $738,000, and I can assure you that the job now done is in no way comparable to the job that was being done when they got $180,000.

The committee only reduced that $100,000, down to $638,000. As it is now, reports come in from abroad from men who are not always trained in reporting. They are supposed to arrive on the first of the quarter, shall we say? They are much more apt not to arrive, or to arrive late. They go to the State Department. They are looked over by someone in the State Department to see if they are satisfactory from a departmental viewpoint. They then go to the Department of Agriculture to be looked over by the Bureau of which I am speaking. They go back to the State Department to be looked over by specialists for that particular country or part of the world. They go to another bureau to be corrected for English and syntax. When that is all accomplished, they are so little like the original report they go back to the Bureau to see if they can be put into some workable form for the farmer. By the time they get to the farmer they are matters of historic interest and not current reports such as we used to get from the agency when it received smaller appropriations. I am citing that as one agency which, in my opinion, has not been overly cut.

Finally, this matter of section 32 funds has been a matter of a great deal of discussion. I think there was some misunderstanding about it. There was on my part. There was also some misunderstanding about the funds before they came down from the Bureau of the Budget, because if you add up with your little adding machine you will find the Bureau of the Budget asked for $100,000,000 out of those funds for the AAA; they asked for $75,000,000 for school lunches; they expected to use $900,000 for management of the marketing agreements; that adds up to more than $145,000,000 or $148,000,000 which might be available next year.

There was some question about uses of the fund. One hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars for teaching people to eat fish is hardly a proper claim against section 32 funds. In the last few days some technical information has reached me from people who are interested in this, which makes me believe that because of the perishable nature of some commodities and also the relationship which the gentleman from Georgia has pointed out between sections 22 and 32, there should be a correction made in this section of the bill, and I am confident, without taking any more of the Committee's time, that this can be properly worked out before the bill comes up tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the Agriculture appropriation bill before us today is the ninth appropriation bill, including the three deficiency measures, to come before the House from the Committee on Appropriations. As a member of that committee I can, with pardonable pride, testify to the painstaking manner in which various operations of the respective departments and agencies have been studied and their needs appraised. The hearings on each and every bill have been exhaustive.

In the instance of the bill before us, for example, it will be noted that the printed hearings fill two volumes of 2,669 pages of testimony. As stated in the committee report accompanying the bill, "an aggregate of departmental, congressional, and outside witnesses would easily total 500 persons." Aside from the actual hearings, the committee members spend many hours and days in personal study of the items involved. Properly to appraise the financial requirements of a department or agency necessitates a complete knowledge of the laws being administered.

The thoroughness, the laborious care with which the Committee on Appropriations has prepared the bills it has reported merits special mention. Over the past several years there was a disposition on the part of Congress to accept, practically without question, every recommended expenditure. We all well remember the days of "blank check" appropriations. It is obviously difficult for the bureaucrats to realize that these days are over; that this new Congress intends to maintain control of the purse strings and to make no appropriations that are not clearly justified.

Whenever the Appropriations Committee reports a bill reducing some item of expenditure or eliminating some other, there inevitably follows this campaign we are experiencing here today to have the cut restored. Our committee is accused of being arbitrary. But, if nothing else, the voluminous hearings that are held should be persuasive evidence that no decision is arbitrary. On the contrary, each decision on each item is the result of long and careful consideration.

The situation is well expressed by the following paragraph to be found on page 5 of the report accompanying the bill before us:

> The committee could follow the route of indiscriminate reductions for the purpose of effecting economies but such a course might result in the serious crippling of essential functions or in nullifying the remainder of the appropriation carried for such an activity. On the other hand, the committee can follow a basic approach which preserves the essential functions, eliminates those which are not regarded as indispensable, and reduces waste, extravagance, and duplication with constant emphasis upon those research activities which in the judgment of the committee are regarded as essential.

In our determination to reduce the cost of Government, to balance the budget and to reduce taxes, the Committee on Appropriations is not recommending indiscriminate reductions in expenditures, as some would have the people believe. As I believe I stated on previous occasions on this floor, some justification can be found for practically every expenditure; but we must determine what is necessary and what is a luxury that we cannot afford. We must select the things that are essential and eliminate the unessential. To economize we simply must have the will to economize.

When the New Deal came into control of the Government our annual budget was only $4,500,000,000. We then entered upon the so-called spend-and-elect policy, and the average budget before the war amounted to $10,000,000,000. The budget submitted to Congress last January by President Truman for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1947, called for $37,500,000,000. In other words, 2 years after the war the Administration proposed to spend three times the average expenditure before the war. It just does not make sense, and particularly considering the fact that we have a national debt of $268,000,000,000.

It is most unfortunate that the administration is unwilling to cooperate with the Congress in placing the country on a sound fiscal basis. President Truman has publicly stated that his $37,500,000,000 budget should not be reduced. We have had very little cooperation from

the departments and bureaus in our efforts to find ways and means to cut expenses. And every appropriation bill that has come to this floor has encountered amendments offered by the Democrats to increase the respective items that have been cut.

Our Democratic friends have made some very fine speeches about how they believe in economy; but, as the record shows, they have for the most part voted against every saving proposed. It is my conviction, however, that in reducing the Government expenditures we are complying with the wishes of the great mass of American people.

The bill under consideration is the sixth regular appropriation bill, as distinguished from the deficiency bills, reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Five have passed the House and one of them has also passed the Senate. The savings made in these respective bills are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Labor-Federal Security | $103,415,959 |
| Treasury-Post Office | 897,072,750 |
| Interior | 134,006,907 |
| State-Justice-Commerce - Judiciary | 159,650,451 |
| Navy | 377,519,200 |
| Agriculture | 383,427,742 |

As of the moment, the Congress has reduced the proposed expenditures for the next fiscal year by $2,055,093,009. We have thus made a very substantial beginning for placing the Government on a peacetime basis. Not a single essential function of the Government will be impaired by any of these cuts in the appropriations. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I believe that even larger cuts could be made in certain items. But the progress that has been made, considering the opposition from the administration and various pressure groups to any reductions, is indeed gratifying.

A reduction in the Government expenditures automatically reduces the number of persons on the Federal pay roll. This, in itself, will eliminate many bureaucrats who have perplexed, harassed, annoyed, and even retarded business with their complicated regulations and countless forms.

By thus reducing Government expenditures, we are able to give our people relief from the heavy burden of taxes, and at the same time reduce the national debt. Taxes have become so high that there is very little incentive for starting a new business or expanding an existing one. As demonstrated in the last war, the productive strength of the United States comes from the thousands of small companies. If we are to have an expanding economy, these small companies must be encouraged to grow and new ones must be brought into existence.

I do not at this time intend to get into a discussion of the effect of high taxes on American production. But I do wish to emphasize that the very first step in any program for making our system of private enterprise function—that all the people may enjoy a higher standard of living—is to eliminate waste and extravagance in Government spending.

I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which is pursuing this objective, and I am confident that the House will uphold the committee on its work. Doubtless some of you have special interest in certain items in this bill and would like to see larger sums appropriated. But in any economy program all of us, whatever our interests, must make certain sacrifices for the common good.

(Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to two features of the agriculture appropriation bill in which Illinois farmers are greatly interested—rural electrification and the soil-conservation program.

Rural electrification is on the threshold of its greatest opportunity for progress. Construction, retarded by war and shortages of manpower and materials, is now able to move forward again at an accelerated pace. Two and a half million farm families still are without electric service and they are waiting impatiently for the light and power that they have seen applied so profitably on other farms in this country.

Yet in the face of this great unfinished job, this House is being asked to cut back the rural electrification program. The agriculture appropriation bill proposes to make this cut-back in two ways. First the bill proposes to reduce the REA loan funds by $25,000,000. There are some who are under the delusion that there is no reduction being made in these loan funds. The fact of the matter is that REA under the bill as it now stands would have $25,000,000 less money to lend for rural electrification. Second, the bill proposes to make a slash of nearly 30 percent in the REA administrative appropriation, a slash so deep that the whole program will be slowed down.

POWER LOBBY INTERESTED

This is not the time to be putting the brakes on rural electrification.

Let me quote from a letter I received a few days ago from a constituent, Mr. Martin Schaefer of Hoyleton, Ill.:

> It seems to me—

He writes—

> that we have a large number of Members in Congress inexperienced in farm problems who together with those people representing the large power interest are trying to deprive about one-half of our farmers the right to enjoy the standard of living the other half enjoys.

This man then points out that the REA funds are merely loan funds, not appropriations. He goes on to say:

> All Congress does is to set aside money to be loaned to REA co-ops which must be repaid with interest. What reason is there to cut this amount to be loaned?

He asks with good reason, and goes on to say:

> We pay monthly installments on the loan. On top of it Uncle Sam's got a mortgage which means we don't own anything till the last pole is paid for plus every cent of interest. I can't understand that any Member of Congress could even think of curtailing or stopping such a program.

FARMERS ENTITLED TO BENEFITS

I want to read just one more paragraph:

> It seems they have money for witch hunting and frankly I feel that just things like this are what creates Communists. Nobody can undermine our Government from the outside. It must come from within and I think actions like this make Communists when one American farmer can have things which Congress denies his neighbor. It's not hard to make a Communist out of a person who is denied the necessities and comforts of life. When you deny lights, homes, roads, health, etc., to one, and give it to another, you get dissatisfaction, hatred, jealousy, and all the means to destroy our Government, and I hope that your long experience will not permit you to go overboard with those who deny those things that make a happy, healthy Nation.

This letter came to me unsolicited. It shows the people back home are watching us here in Washington.

Let us consider that thought before we undertake to damage the great program of rural electrification.

Funds for adequate administration are necessary to the sound operation of any lending program. No banker would be so foolhardy as to lend his money unless he made sure his loans stood an excellent chance of being repaid.

In addition to making new loans on a sound basis and on a basis that will best advance rural electrification, REA must meet the costs of administering loans already made. It is custodian of the Government's interest in more than $1,000,000,000 in loans made up to now.

I know of no other Government program—or any comparable business enterprise—which is doing as economical and as effective a job. As the record shows, this program is being conducted with about one employee, including messengers and clerical employees, for each borrower. And the average borrower is a $1,000,000 enterprise.

REA HAS ENVIABLE RECORD

I challenge anyone to cite a private-lending institution with such a record. The comparison is even more dramatic when it is remembered that most agencies make loans on a well-established basis for not more than 60 percent of the value of the property mortgaged. REA, on the other hand, is making 100-percent loans to new enterprises. And up to now more than $20,000,000 have been paid ahead of schedule, while delinquencies have been negligible.

Everybody is for rural electrification. Even the power company interests who come before our committees say it is a good thing, but at the same time there are many who are trying to rob the program of its effectiveness. It takes more than nice words to keep rural electrification going forward. This means we must provide adequate administrative funds not only to assure sound lending but sound administration of the entire program. It is false economy to do otherwise. The taxpayers have every right to expect the Government to give as much attention to its loans as a private lending institution does. This attention is necessary in order that the rural-electrification program can continue to move forward on the sound basis that

has been established and in order that service can be brought to the two and one-half million farm families still living in the kerosene age.

Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

In my opinion, the proposed cut in the funds for the Soil Conservation Service cuts at the most fundamental part of the agricultural program. The land is the foundation of our agriculture. For generations we neglected it. Finally, after we had experienced giant dust storms, the most devastating floods in our history, and watched tons and acres of our finest land wash down the rivers into the Gulf of Mexico, we decided to do something about it. We were already a hundred years late, but everyone agreed that there was still time if we worked hard and fast.

During the past 10 to 12 years we have made the most remarkable conservation progress of any nation in history. It is true we are still losing our soil over millions of acres every year, but we are also cutting down the rate every year. If we keep at it and support this program, we can put a stop to the waste of erosion, for all practical purposes.

But what does the committee recommend? It would have us cut the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service by $5,437,000 below the budget estimate, and $5,300,000 below the appropriation granted the Service for the present fiscal year.

VALUABLE AND NECESSARY SERVICE

Almost all of the money appropriated to this Service is used to employ people. And 93 percent of the people hired by this Service are doing technical work of various kinds, expert work, that is directly helping farmers apply sound conservation measures to their land. This, I say, is a valuable and necessary service. It has won the widespread approval of farmers and city people alike. It is a service that is protecting the productive capacity of American agriculture.

Somewhere along the line somebody must have misinformed the committee, because in their report on this bill they say that we do not need as much technical assistance in soil conservation districts now as we did when the districts were new. That, I submit, is a highly erroneous point of view. I have three of the finest soil conservation districts in the country in my congressional district and they have made outstanding progress. But they are actually just getting started. They have 10 or 20 years of hard work ahead of them. Every one of these years, the farmers are going to need the help of these Soil Conservation Service technicians if they are going to do their job right.

The committee seemed to be laboring under the impresison that the Soil Conservation Service sends its men into an area to hold meetings and do educational work. That is certainly not the case. Our State Extension Service does the educational job. What the Soil Conservation Service provides is expert technical assitance to the individual farmer—one farmer after another—in working out the detailed soil and water conservation problems he has on his farm. No other agency of Government does this job.

WORK MUST BE DONE IN FIELD

I know from the experience in my own district that this is the kind of work that has to be done field by field. And you have to go right out on to each field—analyze it thoroughly and build your conservation measures accordingly. It is a painstaking job and one that is going to take some time. It is also going to take some money—but as long as we are going to spend money on agriculture, where can we spend it better, for the most lasting results, than in the protection of our land? What good will it do us to take care of everything else in agriculture if we let our land wash away in the meantime?

There is only one way to conserve our farmlands and stop erosion: That is to put the land experts out there where they can work in soil conservation districts—helping one farmer after another until the whole job is done.

If the Soil Conservation Service is restricted to the funds proposed by the committee it will be forced, according to my information, to cut its assitance to soil conservation districts by 22 percent under the amount furnished this year. Unless we grant the Soil Conservation Service more money—at least enough to work with all the soil conservation districts of the country—we will be undercutting the soil conservation program and falling down on the farmers who want to protect their lands against erosion.

That simply does not make good sense. If we must make these big cuts in the agricultural program, let us make them somewhere in the superstructure. Let us not undermine the foundation of the whole thing.

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a distinguished writer once called the parable of the prodigal son the most perfect story plot ever contrived. That parable has provided the framework for the story of human frailities many times in many forms. It provides an ideal framework for the story of American political life of the last decade and a half. Let me tell you the story of American agriculture and American political parties in that framework.

There was a great nation called the United States. And this Nation had two great political parties. One was called the Democratic Party, and the other was called the Republican Party. Now the Republican Party in the year 1920 said to the Nation, "Give me that part of the estate which is mine. Give me the rulership of this Nation. The Democratic Party has had it long enough."

And the Nation—foolishly—did as it was asked. It gave to the Republicans the rich inheritance of leadership of the land which had become the wealthiest and the strongest on earth.

But, alas, this party encouraged lavish and worthless investments in far-off countries. It watched the paper values of the exchanges on Wall Street rise high on the hot wind of speculation. It looked at the ticker tape and clapped its hands and said, "All is right with the world. Such and such a stock is up another five points."

Yes; stocks on the market exchanges were up. And that seemed good indeed. But stocks on the farm were up; too—piling up year by year in mountainous surpluses of cotton and wheat—and that was bad, because as the surpluses grew, the prices shrank until taxes, mortgages, and interest ate up all the income, and farmers were knocked into bankruptcy like tenpins by the big black ball of economic depression.

First it was only the farmers. But then, like a great dark cloud, economic catastrophe overtook the speculators in the exchanges, and the manufacturers, bankers, and merchants in the markets, and the laborers and clerks in their humble homes. A terrible famine of jobs and profits spread over the whole land. The price of wheat was never so low in three centuries as it was then. The value of farm exports was never so low in well nigh 50 years. The buying power of farmers' products fell to about half their pre-World War level. The farm fourth of the Nation virtually ceased to be customers for city goods.

Desperate in the effort to hold their properties, farmers mined the soil, frantically endeavoring to dig up, as if by the roots, enough cash to meet their costs of interest and taxes. And millions of acres lost fertility and topsoil while farmers lost their homes and their land.

Agriculture was prostrate.

The low state to which agriculture had fallen by 1932 is not easily forgotten. In that year farm operators went bankrupt at a rate of one every 2 minutes—and this they did 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. Many farm laborers were glad to work for room and board. Mortgage debt alone took a tenth of the farmer's gross income—to say nothing of taxes and other costs.

The average price of a bushel of wheat fell to 38 cents; corn to 32 cents; oats to 16 cents. The price of a pound of tobacco was 11 cents; cotton, 7 cents; beef, 4 cents; hogs, 3 cents.

And the carry-over of cotton rose almost fourfold in less than a decade, so that the people of my own State of Texas and of the whole South trembled on the brink of wholesale bankruptcy.

And over the radio punsters quipped, with an undertone of fear in their voices, about signs in public places being changed from "Keep off the grass" to "Don't eat the grass."

The Republican Party had dissipated the Nation's economy. Such was the inheritance of the Democratic Party when called upon by the people to rehabilitate a prostrate nation.

Then began the long struggle which has brought to this Nation the greatest agricultural prosperity it has ever known.

Net income from agriculture last year was not two or three times, but eight times as great as in 1932.

Foreclosures and assignments were reduced not to one-half or one-fourth of the number in 1932, but to one-twentieth.

From near collapse, American agriculture has today reached a position where it is a hundred-billion-dollar-plus industry, where its quick assets of currency, bank deposits, and Government bonds total some twenty billions, where farmers have a 93 percent equity in their business.

What a difference.

From a level of about 50 percent below parity in 1932, farm prices climbed to 32 percent above parity in October 1946.

From a condition in which the elephant heel of surpluses, of cotton and wheat particularly, were crushing the life out of agriculture, we have today only a normal carry-over of wheat and no more Commodity Credit Corporation cotton to sell.

From a total mortgage debt of about $9,000,000,000 in 1932—and a negligible amount of quick assets—agriculture in mid 1946 had a total mortgage debt of little more than five billions—and quick assets nearly four times that amount.

In 1932 agriculture was flat broke. In 1946 it was richer than at any time in history.

What a difference.

And how that difference is making itself felt. In 1932 farmers were no longer sizable customers for tractors and trucks, for new homes and barns, for furniture and clothing. But today, manufacturers and merchants can hear the jingle jangle of coins in farmers' jeans—and back of those coins are plenty of rectangular green-backed pieces of paper that fall soundlessly but joyously into the cash registers, even as the gentle dew from heaven.

Farmers want tractors—200,000 a year a survey showed, for 3 years after the war's end.

Farmers want trucks and cars—a billion dollars' worth.

Farmers want building improvements—another billion dollars' worth.

Farmers want household goods—$400,000,000 worth a year for 3 years after the war.

And they have the cold cash to back up their wants in a way that gives solid assurance of an era of continued prosperity.

What a difference.

Admittedly, the war was a big factor in the booming prosperity many farmers have enjoyed these last 5 years. But prosperity was well on the way long before Pearl Harbor—long before war broke out in Europe. The growth of buying power of the American farmer started in 1933.

I am not going to recite the details of that climb and of the sweeping agricultural legislation that helped farmers to climb out of the depression. I am merely going to put into a few sentences the highlights of what has been accomplished, using my own State of Texas as an example.

First. The agricultural adjustment program helped farmers produce in accordance with the needs of the people. It enabled them to set up a complete ever-normal granary program which supported prices of basic crops and maintained stable reserves. It made it possible for farmers to use soil-conserving practices that added untold wealth to the Nation's natural resources. Did that program pay dividends? I have heard it said that the ever-normal granary alone meant as much to the Nation in the winning of the war as an extra army or an extra fleet of ships.

Second. Under the national soil-conservation program 30,000,000 acres have been devoted to organized conservation. In 1945 more than half the Nation's farms, containing three-quarters of our cropland, participated in carrying out soil-conserving or erosion-preventing practices. Under this program and the adjustment program, American farmers built up a bank of fertility and they drew upon it heavily to help win the war. Did it pay? In Texas alone some 40,000 farms covering 15,000,000 acres have been aided by the Soil Conservation Service in applying conservation plans. A survey of typical farmers showed that soil conservation enabled them to step up their yields per acre by an average of 26.5 percent.

Third. The farm-credit programs during the tough going of the 1930's helped farmers refinance their mortgages, reduce their interest payments, and keep their farms. Did that pay? In Texas 250,000 Farm Credit and Production Credit Association loans were made in amounts totaling $725,000,000.

Fourth. The farm-security program helped farm tenants become owners and small farm owners to improve their economic position either by getting additional land or by more efficient farming. Did that pay? I wish the 87,000 Texas farmers who received rehabilitation loans were here to answer that question. I wish the 4,000 farmers who took out farm-ownership loans were here to tell you. Already nine-tenths of the principal of the rehabilitation loans has been repaid and the tenant purchase borrowers have paid up 86 percent more than would be required on the basis of equal annual installments to pay their loans in full in 40 years.

Fifth. The rural electrification program brought power and light to millions of American farmers, helping them to increase their production efficiency and to improve their living standards. In Texas alone, from the beginning of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935 until the end of 1945, a total of $53,500,000 was loaned to provide electric power to farmers. REA loans were used to construct 44,000 miles of distribution lines serving 114,000 consumers in rural Texas. At the end of 1945, REA borrowers in the State had met all interest and principal payments due on their loans and had paid $1,200,000 on principal ahead of due dates. Did it pay? Here is an interesting fact. Eleven years ago when the rural electrification program was started, only about 1 Texas farmer out of 50 had electrical service. That proportion has been stepped up to 1 out of 3. For the whole Nation, the proportion of farms with electricity has risen from about 10 percent to close to 50 percent.

I could go on for a long time talking about the marketing agreements, about water facilities, and flood control, about price supports, commodity loans, and conservation payments. I could talk about the farm-labor program that in 1945 helped more than 77,000 Texas farmers secure workers. I could talk about the research programs which have paid such big dividends to the Nation—hybrid corn seed, for example, or the production of penicillin in commercial quantities, or the development of dusts and sprays containing DDT.

But I am going to pass over all of those features and mention simply the protection farmers are given under the so-called Steagall amendment, which assures price support for major agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity or higher until January 1, 1949. Thus, American agriculture is protected by a floor under prices. We all know why this measure was adopted. It was adopted because our Democratic Party was determined that American farmers should not again be the forgotten men they were after the other World War. It was adopted because looming very big in the minds of the President and the Congress was the memory of the terrible collapse of farm prices in 1920 and 1921. In less than a year, at that time, farm prices plummeted down more than 40 percent.

That is not happening this time.

Well, there is the record. There are the facts. As has been said: "The farmer and the farmer's family can measure for themselves the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs and the recovery which is theirs." Surely the record—in peace and war alike—is good.

And today the people of this Nation are enjoying the greatest abundance of the products of the farm they have ever known.

Let me again cite the record. With fewer farms and with 10 percent fewer workers than in prewar, with shortages of machinery and materials, without plowing up the parks and plains, American agriculture during World War II stepped up production more than one-third, sent up to one-fourth of its products off to war, and at the same time fed civilians 10 percent better than in peacetime.

Not only that, but year by year and every year—beginning not in 1942 or in 1940 but away back in 1937 and going right through the war—American agriculture set new production records every year. Every year a new record. Every year more food than the year before. Meat production jumped by about one-half over the 1935–39 average, and egg production by about three-fifths. Commercial truck crops increased by about two-fifths. Output of some of the war-valuable vegetable oil crops, such as soybeans and flaxseed, tripled or more than tripled.

And how was it done? Not by putting on three shifts. First, there was not labor available and, second, it would not have made much difference anyway, because three shifts cannot make the land

produce and the sun and rain work any faster.

It was done by long hours, by hard work, by technological improvement—and by a legislative program that helped the farmer go all-out.

It was possible only because agriculture had been snatched from the near death of the early 1930's and restored to the vitality and good health of the 1940's.

Now that is a long story about agricultural progress and prosperity. It is a story that should be of great interest to our Republican colleagues because it is the picture of the sound, healthy agricultural situation which they, as members of the dominant party, are inheriting as we begin this year 1947. Will they keep it that way during their tenure of office? It cannot be done by trusting to luck and ignoring the farmer's problems as they have done many times in the past.

There are many problems to be decided about the future—such problems as making full use of the farmers' remarkable increase in productive capacity. Inevitably, there must be readjustment from a wartime to a peacetime production pattern. In times past, the inability to change pace, to shift gears, has been agriculture's biggest handicap. In the last 14 years, however, farmers have learned much about the necessity for making production fit demand—something that industry has long recognized. They have built up the machinery to make that adjustment through the legislative programs and particularly through the national production goals.

Thus, during the war the goals helped farmers produce the tremendous quantities of meat, milk, wheat, corn, cotton, eggs, and other strategic foods that a fighting nation requires. Now with the return of peace the goals are helping agriculture emphasize such production as is most needed.

To make the goal mechanism work, there obviously must be unified action. There must be leadership. In the case of depressed markets, there must be income protection. All these requirements can be provided only by a continuation of full-fledged cooperation between farmers and Government.

Another outstanding problem—a continuing problem and one which farmers have already made a good start in solving—is that of soil and water waste which in the first one-third of this country made almost a million acres a year unfit for further cultivation.

The conservation job is well underway, but there still is a big job ahead. The task of applying the basic soil and water saving measures will take years and—in the interests of the whole American people—there must be no slackening of the work.

And then there is the problem of regaining adequate foreign trade in farm commodities. By means of the World Bank and various international agreements, the Government is endeavoring to help agriculture build up international commerce. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is another phase of the world-wide effort to make agriculture strong and prosperous so that hunger may eventually be banished from the earth along with the great threat to peace that hunger inevitably carries with it.

The whole marketing picture needs to be examined and in some ways revamped. The recent Democratic Congress took a big step in this direction with the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act, authorizing widespread research to discover new uses for farm products, new markets for old products, new methods in making distribution of farm commodities not only more efficient but also more profitable.

But the most fundamental factor in the maintenance of a prosperous and healthy agriculture is a continuance of a full employment, full production economy.

This is the most elementary economics. The income of the 25,000,000 farm people must come primarily from the spending of the 115,000,000 city, town, and village people. The amount of food money in the city wage earner's pocket is one of the measuring sticks of the farmer's prosperity. In a full employment economy where the wage level is good, much of our new-found agricultural productivity can and will be absorbed.

During the depression a large proportion of city, town, and village people could not buy anywhere near the amount of food they wanted. Millions were seriously undernourished. The effects of their malnutrition were evident not only in lowered health standards but in reduced farm income.

Here is a challenge that should call forth the best that is in us. This great Nation is capable of producing enough food to provide its people with a good diet. The importance of good diet to national health and strength is a fact we cannot afford to ignore. It remains for all of us to make sure that the American people have the means of purchasing the food which farmers are so capable of producing.

We have made great progress toward the goals of security, opportunity, and prosperity. Whatever lies beyond the veil that hides the future from our eyes, this much at least is assured: Never in all American history has agriculture been so well prepared to adjust its operations to demand. Never has it been better able to plan a wise use of the land to provide continuous, abundant, profitable production for the needs of the whole people.

That, I am sure, is the conclusion that even the Republican Party must draw after a good look at the Democratic record.

For the welfare of American agriculture and of the whole Nation, I sincerely hope that the Republican Party will not allow their inheritance of a sound and prosperous agricultural situation to be frittered away.

Nothing is more fundamental than to keep agriculture, the backbone of the Nation's economy, straight and strong. But today American agriculture is at the crossroads. It can continue strong and healthy or it can sink into the shabby doldrums of the early thirties. The legislative responsibility of the majority party cannot be alibied or escaped, and if the bill which we are considering today—which arbitrarily cuts, slashes, or eliminates these measures which have been so important to American agriculture—is any indication of the policy which the Republicans intend to follow, then the outlook for agriculture is indeed black.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss some of the forest conservation items in the Forest Service appropriation as shown in H. R. 3601.

Those of us who have been in close touch, for many years, with the work of the Forest Service are concerned by the action taken by the committee. The necessity for developing our forest wealth to the maximum needs no lengthy exposition. The story has been heard frequently on the floors of this Congress.

I am particularly concerned about some of the specific cuts the committee has made. A deep cut in national-forest administration, the great part of which is designed to increase present timber sale business, is short-sighted. I question the committee's comment that a good deal of this is a reduction merely in paper work. Much of this reduction will be felt in the ranger and supervisor jobs, where the ultimate work of the Service must be done. If we want to build our national forests up we cannot reduce in the forces needed to put good management into practice.

I am also concerned about two reductions made in the research items. One deals with the work of the Madison Laboratory. It is regrettable that this cut has been made and the reasons given by the committee that the laboratory has not enjoyed the esteem of the Congress and that its work is academic and visionary seem to me to be quite contrary to the facts. The Laboratory has an enviable reputation for having pioneered and for having advanced the whole field of forest products in America. Its reputation extends beyond the boundaries of America as an outstanding institution, particularly for its contributions to the war. This was accomplished because it was able to draw upon a large backlog of research work. The basic work that the laboratory has advanced has been, and will continue to be, translated into practical things by industry. I want to call attention to some things that are not visionary or impractical accomplishments of the laboratory: They developed the semi-chemical-pulping process now in use, which makes possible pulping of species never used before and with higher yields per cord of wood. This will have real importance if we are to meet the existing paper shortage. The work of the laboratory on converting waste material to yeast and alcohol is now bringing to the field a new industry of considerable importance.

May I say right here that some 3 weeks ago I visited a plant newly erected in Springfield, Oreg., which was producing alcohol, good 192 proof ethyl alcohol from sawdust. This plant at Springfield, Oreg., is a full-scale commercial plant producing some 4,000,000 gallons a year,

or it will produce that much when it gets into full production, and it was made possible only because of the Madison Laboratory work on the pilot plant. The work on laminated woods and new packaging techniques furnished the Navy and the Army sources of material for their war needs—material which they never had before and when they needed it most. Those of us in the West who have profited by the findings of the laboratory would feel that it is a mistake to decrease the work at this time.

The other research cut deals with the Forest Survey, which aims to give a sound inventory of our resources, our requirements, and our drains. This work, too, cannot be characterized, as the committee has done, as academic and lacking in practical value. It has been of inestimable value in the Pacific Northwest, where the original survey is completed and is now being maintained. Similar data are needed for all the forest lands of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the committee, 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as we come to the consideration of this Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948, there are a number of curious things in connection with it. I have served on this committee for some several years now and with the members of the Republican majority who were on this committee prior to this year.

The surprising thing when we read this report is that practically every program that has been absolutely ruined in this bill was approved and subscribed to by the Republican members of the subcommittee no later than last year. Having approved these programs last year, it is surprising that we find this year these same gentlemen coming into the Congress with a bill which virtually ruins those programs. Looking back over the situation we may be able to find some explanation for that. Last year this bill was considered shortly before the election. It was then their hope that the Republican Party would recapture control of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. Of course, it is a matter of history that they did so capture control of both of these bodies. The majority of the Members of the House and of the Senate from agricultural regions other than the South are in the Republican Party.

Shortly after that election in November we began to read in the press that the Republican Party came back on the basis it was going to reduce expenditures. That is a worthy objective. Since I have been a Member of this House I have tried to vote for economy in Government. When we got here in January, however, we learned what it was intended to do with these savings that they were going to make through a cut in expenditures. When these four committees met to adopt this $6,000,000,000 reduction, of course that was not binding, but it read good. It read like it was carrying out the mandate of the people to the Republican Party. At that meeting we on the Democratic side tried to provide that such savings as were made would be applied to retirement of the national debt. We understand what it means to do without in order to pay what you owe. Nearly all of us as individuals have had that experience.

In the meeting of these four committees over which the Republicans had control, they refused to provide that the money which was saved would be applied to reduction of the national debt. We saw from the press that another of their promises to the American people was to reduce the income tax. So this $6,000,000,000 cut was tied in with what was then known as the Knutson bill. Under that bill, a man with a $300,000 income would have gotten an increase in his carry-home pay of as much as 69 percent. The small fellow who got $1,000 would have gotten an increase of 2.1 percent and the man with a $10,000 income only 6.1 percent.

In carrying out this commitment, where did they start out in January to get this money, not to apply on the national debt but to be used in passing the Knutson bill which got too hot for them. They passed a bill, however, that is virtually no better. Where did they start out in January to get that money?

When they called the House Appropriations Committee together we first noticed it. When they set up the subcommittees, in every instance but 1, in 10 of them to be exact, there was a division of 4 Republicans to 3 Democrats. But when they got to the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations there was a division of 5 Republicans to 3 Democrats. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this bill and certain phases of it was a direct result of that overwhelming vote on this committee of 5 Republicans to 3 Democrats. So we can see back in January there was some intent to see that these cuts were made and applied to agriculture, and they were used to pass this tax bill that now rests in the other body.

There is another thing that is most unusual here. Back in February, of all the subcomittees of the Appropriations Committees there was only one that I know of where the chairman of the committee then before any hearings submitted to the committee how much the cuts were going to be and where they were going to be made. That was done by the chairman of this Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Of course, when the news got out that he planned to provide no funds for research in utilization and marketing of agricultural products as authorized under the Hope-Flannagan bill, when it got out that it called for the elimination of the school-lunch program, when they learned it would do away with a great deal of the Rural Electrification Administration, of course, when the heat got too strong with regard to those three segments of the bill, they were not treated as they announced they were going to be treated in February, and some provision is made in this bill for those programs, although the bill is inadequate in my judgment.

Now, there is another thing that I think might be called to your attention and that is this: After this committee had been in session for 8 weeks, after we had marked up the bill, after the clerks had printed the hearings, after the report had been prepared and the tables compiled, 10 days after all that had been done, on last Monday, there was a meeting of the Republican steering committee, and in the press the next morning there was a statement that the Republicans were falling far behind in their efforts to make it possible to pass their tax bill and what do we find when that statement appeared in the press? We find the very next day this committee, having completed its labors 10 days before, and though these five gentlemen—and they are most estimable gentlemen—on the Republican side had taken their knife and applied it to the Department after 8 weeks of hearing witnesses, and after having done what I feel sure they believed was a good job, after having reduced the Department $337,000,000—10 days after that, when the Republican steering committee had met and determined that they had to go back and cut some more if they were going to be able to pass this tax bill, the first committee that was called back was the Committee on Appropriations for Agriculture, and we met in session on Wednesday, and there, too late to get what we did in the report, they adopted four amendments. One of those did away with the farm-tenant purchase program under the Farmers' Home Administration. They said to the 49,000 veterans who made applications for loans under their program, and they said to the 35,000 who now have their applications in the process of being approved, "We have cut you off because we have got to have the money for the tax-reduction bill." There is no fund for that for the next year. And they looked at the triple A and they said, "Why, under the triple A program you are not supposed to get payments unless you do certain things for yourselves and for your own land. It has cost you about $2 for each dollar that the Government promised to pay." They said, "We need some more money, so instead of having to prove that you did this work, you just come in and say you did it and we will give you the money so that we can cut $8,000,000 more and make that available for this tax bill." That was done.

Then we come to crop insurance. The testimony from the Department was that it would take $4,000,000 to wind up the affairs of the crop insurance program, but in their need for additional funds, they cut the $2,000,000 that they had earlier allowed to $1,000,000. Even though the present chairman of the committee last year, when they were trying to reduce the administrative fund for the Farmers' Home Administration, then the Farm Security Administration, when he spoke against a simple cut of $1,000,000, from $24,000,000 to $23,000,000, said "I will not be a party to meat-ax methods of reducing expenditures." Notwithstanding that, when this committee met, it went into that phase of this program and the administrative fund is cut approximately 40 percent when they have outstanding

loans of more than $800,000,000 that must be serviced and should be collected.

Here is something I want you to keep in mind, and this is most unsuual. There were two little items that came up in that meeting of the rump committee, as some people have termed these call-backs. At the same meeting held about 10 days after the business affairs of the committee were over there were two little bills of $7,500 which two good members of that party wanted to get through. The Department had not sent them down. They had not even considered them. The Bureau of the Budget did not send them down. They had not considered them. Now, do not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to consideration of requests of individual Members who know the situation and who have a personal interest in presenting these matters, but 10 days after the committee was through, and when they were called back to strike out $40,000,000 more out of the appropriation for agriculture, they spend their time approving two additional projects that individual members of the Republican Party were interested in of $7,500 each. That was a part of the committee action.

But, here is the unusual circumstance connected with this, gentlemen. When the whole committee met and the Republican members of this subcommittee submitted in writing the action of the subcommittee in which they wiped out this $40,000,000, lo and behold these two little bills that were stirred up to take care of individual Members, without any showing at all, had been overlooked. When I asked the question as to why they were not included, it was said, "Why, they were adopted so late that we could not bring them here without having to mess up the entire tabulations and tables. We could not figure them through these reports."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. In just a moment.

Of course, my question then was, "How could you figure the $40,000,000 that you cut away back through these reports, when they were adopted the same morning?" We have had no real answer to that as yet. You are bound to reach the conclusion that it was determined that it might be a little embarrassing, but I doubt that that would embarrass any group who would come here this year and absolutely destroy several of the farm programs which they sponsored and approved less than a year ago and preceding the last election.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman has in part answered the question I have not asked. As I recall, the reason for the two items to which the gentleman refers was that the matters had come up after the bill was closed. I thought perhaps the gentleman also wanted to include in the list the money we voted to repair the damages due to the Oklahoma tornado, which came up at the same time and which was included at the same time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman mean to indicate that they are of somewhat the same nature, the Oklahoma situation and that in the gentleman's district and that in the district of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am quite sure the gentleman wants to be accurate, and will say it was not in this gentleman's district.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the gentleman's State; perhaps I am in error.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman, but we have 23 Congressmen in California.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, and we feel the weight of their votes sometimes, as we apparently did this morning in the vote on the rule.

I have never opposed any cuts in the Department of Agriculture. I believe I have a good record here in economy. I subscribe to most of the reductions in this bill if they were properly applied. But to show you that the cuts in this Department are a result of the pressures of the announcement of certain political leaders in the Republican Party, read this bill, and you will not see where there is any case where there must be a reduction in personnel, with one exception, and that is that in the Information Service it is limited to 250 people.

When they set out to absolutely ruin the Soil Conservation Service and the triple-A payments because of the duplication between those agencies and the Extension Service, I said, "Gentlemen, do not ruin a service to the American people. If there are faults and duplications that ought to be eliminated, and I agree with you that there are, this committee should consolidate all those supervisory and administrative personnel, and I will go along with you in doing that." But no, they were not interested in that, they just cut the total amount of money, because what is necessary is to show up with the funds.

I tried to do that throughout this bill. When they got to the REA, the chief objection, and you gentlemen will bear me out, to the REA appropriation for administrative funds was objections to certain people who have to do with that administration. I do not believe there is a Member of this House who would intentionally—I do not know what the pressures are from the national party, never having undergone such pressures myself, but I do not believe in the face of any pressure from any party that any man from an agricultural region would have the courage to cut down the expansion of the Rural Electrification Administration, as much as it means to the rural people of this country. But I think it must be agreed that the chief reason for this cut in the administrative expenses of the REA was a disagreement with, dislike of, or failure to appreciate the capacity of certain people who have to do with this operation. Of course, there could be real merit to that with regard to a few people. I do not know, many of them are able, conscientious administrators, but I do say that I tried to get the majority members of this committee to bring the Secretary of Agriculture in here. I said to the committee, "If there is something wrong with the administration of this agency, let us correct it, but let us not cut out a service to the American people, let us not cripple an agency here which means more to the farm people and those who live in rural areas than almost anything that has been done in this Government."

One of the biggest reasons for the necessity of setting up this administration in the outset was because the utility companies had gone into the more populous areas and gotten the so-called cream of the crop. The first local REA associations quite naturally were set up in the more populous areas. The first lines built were through the more populous areas, and it is only during the last few years that proper attention has been given to area coverage and to planning so that eventually this service can be given to all rural people. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention also to the fact that when a local REA association borrows money from the Government, makes its original plan, and has it approved, that the Rural Electrification Administration is without power to expand their service and carry their lines to other areas where they give additional service to still more people. However, the Rural Electrification Administration does have an opportunity to do that when the additional loans are requested, the so-called class B loans. Under the law, once the local co-op is created, expansion is in the hands of the directors and manager of the local association. Certainly they should, and I believe they do, want to expand this service to their neighbors and to others in their own area who have been unable to get current. But we need the national administration to assist in making available poles, transformers, and materials, and to see in this time of shortage that all of that does not go into the hands of the utility companies. Most of these directors are not experienced engineers, and they need the benefit of the national association and engineers for planning so that eventually the line can be built economically to all rural people of the Nation, and yet though practically all the money requested for loan authority is made available, the fund for the rural electrification is reduced by one-third.

The first of this year there were two and one-half million farm families still living without electric light and power. It is estimated that in addition to these unelectrified farms there are more than 2,000,000 rural establishments such as schools, crossroads business places, and rural dwellings not on farms that do not have high-line power.

Few counties, even in the most prosperous areas, have completed their rural electrification. While a big and difficult part of the job remaining is in the less densely settled areas of the West, it is a fact that almost 60 percent of the unelectrified farms are east of the Mississippi River. The States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, as a group, have more unelectrified farms than all of the 11 westernmost States together.

Nine States each have more than 120,000 farms still awaiting the highlines. In each of 18 States there are more than 60,000 farms without electricity.

These figures give an indication of the magnitude of what has yet to be done. The REA today has a backlog of applications for rural-electrification loans totaling $237,000,000 and will have $270,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year. Farmers in every State and every community are insisting that they be given the opportunity to provide themselves with electricity. Even though good progress has been made during these dozen years, the fact that approximately 43 percent of the Nation's farms still are unelectrified represents a powerful challenge to future action.

Such reduction would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. It would be costly in terms of dollars, and even more costly in terms of accomplishing the objectives of rural electrification.

The Congress has authorized a billion-dollar investment in rural electrification. This investment is self-liquidating but is not and cannot be self-administered. The Government's contracts must be carried out and the Government's security must be protected. Common business sense requires this. An arbitrary reduction in the funds for administration of this program is unwarranted and unwise—it is just poor business. Let us examine the facts.

As every single member of this House representing a rural area well knows, the extension of electricity is today more desired than any other single improvement that can come to unserved rural areas. No single thing can so greatly reduce the difference between rural and urban living standards as the taking of electricity to farm homes. Fortunately, we have in the REA program a method in this country by which that objective can be accomplished on a self-liquidating basis.

The rural electrification program is being carried forward through nearly one thousand individual farmer-owned cooperatives. Up until the war and some since with the guidance, counsel, and encouragement which the relatively small staff of the Rural Electrification Administration has been able to give, these farmer-managed cooperatives have been constantly growing and reaching out to serve more and more of their neighbors. It can be said, almost without exception, plans are getting started to carry the REA program forward in every single rural community of this Nation. Today there are REA-financed lines in more than 2,200 counties. There are nearly one and three-quarter million farm families and other rural consumers receiving service from REA-financed lines. New consumers are going on REA-financed lines at the rate of 25,000 per month. Plans projected into 1948 indicate that the program will accelerate to a point where new consumers will be connected at a rate exceeding one-half million per year.

Even though the cooperatives are pushing into thinner and thinner territory, their financial record is excellent. They have repaid more than twenty million dollars on their loans before the due date.

Although the progress during the past 12 years has been amazing, with the percentage of farms electrified increasing from 11 to about 57 percent, there still remain about two and one-half million unserved farm homes—some of them, incidentally, in every rural congressional district—and at least 2,000,000 other unserved rural dwellings, churches, schools and the like. To these unserved people the great progress made during the last decade is meaningless. Their homes are as dark and their lives filled with as much drudgery now as they were before the program started. It is in terms of those people that we must think.

We want the cooperatives to be constantly encouraged to take in new members and to build more lines—in fact to get on with the job of electrifying rural America. More importantly, we must rely on the REA staff to give to the efforts of each of these hundreds of cooperatives in 46 States, a national plan of area coverage which will assure that the benefits of electricity will be made available in all rural areas in the most economical manner possible at the earliest possible date.

ADEQUATE SUPPORT IS NOT GIVEN FOR THE RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

Mr. Chairman, it has been recognized for many years that research in agriculture has worked wonders. It has given us improved seed, greater production from the same investment and from the same work. We have seen total production of agriculture products multiplied many times as a result of research in production. And as a result this country has been able to produce and meet the needs through this war. We have seen production reach untold limits, and except for the world's needs we would have tremendous surpluses today. Just as soon as the world is able to supply its own needs even to a limited extent, surpluses will pile up again in this great Nation.

The chairman of the agriculture legislative committee and the ranking Democrats on the committee, Mr. HOPE and Mr. FLANAGAN, joined by my able colleague, Mr. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, realizing that this situation was not too far off, last year passed through this Congress the Agriculture Marketing Act of 1946, known as the Hope-Flanagan bill.

Duties levied on imported agricultural commodities have been used to protect the farmers of this country from the impact of disastrous price collapse that follows a little surplus production and has given the low-income consumers access to better foods. This action strikes at farmers of the entire Nation.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee has taken upon itself to repeal one of the major legislative actions of this Congress in history for the protection of American agriculture and the granting to those that engage in agriculture fair treatment with industrial production which through the years has had protection, and in its action is completely usurping the jurisdiction, rights, and prerogatives of the great agriculture legislative committee headed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman recalls, of course, that we have not reduced any of the loans for the REA. Is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is a $25,000,000 reduction.

Mr. HORAN. That was not a loan fund.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is a slight reduction, although I doubt the loan authority has been seriously crippled.

Mr. HORAN. To give an illustration, the gentleman recalls perhaps that it is the experience of the REA cooperatives in his own district that in some cases it has been a matter of overadministration or overregulation on the part of the REA at the Federal level.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. Can you tell us why the Committee on Appropriations brought an amendment here to the act dealing with the lending powers of the REA rather than submit that question to the House Committee on Agriculture which wrote the provisions providing how the loans are to be made and how the REA should get its funds?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is a rather difficult question to answer. The action of this committee does not reflect my own views. Apparently, it was believed that now is the time to act and that the majority members of the committee could do as good or even better a job than the folks on your committee. That is about the only way I can see it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Did your committee find any reason why under the plan set up by the House Committee on Agriculture for the REA to obtain these loans and get money with which to operate they did not recommend to the Committee on Agriculture that this committee study the question and report the necessary changes back to the Congress for action?

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say with regard to that particular provision, doubtless it is an improvement over the former procedure, but in view of the history of the differences between the legislative committee and the appropriations subcommittee, certainly I think it would have been much, much better, instead of bringing it in in this way that appropriate action had been recommended to the gentleman's committee and acted upon by that committee.

I now yield to my chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In direct response to my friend from Missouri, this matter was initiated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation itself after a check with the Budget Bureau, the budget officer, and the Budget Division of the Department of Agriculture, for the reason that it would be far better to go directly to the Treasury with a consequent saving of three-quarters of 1 percent in administrative costs and thereby enable an economy of $25,000,000 to be effected because it was not necessary then to cover the so-called 85 percent collateral clause in the basic law. That is the answer.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that he encourages and favors representatives from the REA or

any other Government agency coming before your committee?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I suggest that the gentleman referred to the RFC?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am speaking now of the RFC or the REA coming before your committee and suggesting changes to be made in the basic law rather than to have these people come to the legislative committees of the Congress which were set up to do that job? Can you explain why you encourage that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my good friend from Missouri that I encourage everybody in government to come and see me individually or in my capacity as chairman if I think it will enhance efficiency and economy in government.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then you advocate that all of these departments come to your committee and let you write the law with respect to these departments rather than to the legislative committees of this House. Is that what you are advocating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was not the gentleman's question in the first place. I encouraged those people to come, because I like to get these ideas that will give us sounder and more efficient governmental structure.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will you explain again, are we to let people come to a star chamber session where the public is not invited, where nobody knows what is going on, and there formulate the policies of these agencies and departments of government, without anybody outside being advised about what is going on until this report finally comes out a day or two before the bill is up for consideration?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman's question is beautifully academic, because all hearings are closed in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do you think, then, admitting they are all closed, that that committee should assume to take over the burden of the legislative duties of this Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not, but may I remind the gentleman that every legislative proviso in this bill is coupled with an economy. That is the important point.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then you can justify revising and revamping practically all of the legislative action of this Congress that has been had by its legislative committees? Is that right?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman knows the answer to that as well as I do. The answer is "No." It must be done within reasonable limits and with the proper restrictions.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think this Congress should know pretty soon just how far the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives proposes to go when it deals with legislative matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best answer is the history of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I state to the gentleman from Missouri that you have a perfect example of how far the committee will go in the bill now being considered.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There are five different provisions in this bill rewriting the law governing certain agencies and groups.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I remind the gentleman that in other years, when your party was in power, the subcommittee used to come in here with a dozen or fifteen provisions in the bill. We have been very modest and restrained.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that he well knows, because he is a very able and efficient Member of this body——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman well knows the proposition was made that appropriations for certain things that were beneficial to agriculture would not be made, because there was no basic law authorizing the appropriations, and finally this House said that unless you have legislative action for these appropriations, we are not going to give them to you. The gentleman well knows that the House Committee on Agriculture went to the Appropriations Committee, of which you were a member, and asked for a list of the things that needed legislative support. The House Committee on Agriculture sat down and wrote a bill, containing, I think, 75 or 80 different provisions, every one you said was necessary to obviate a rule waiving points of order, and we passed that bill in this House. Yet, in spite of that fact, your committee comes back today in five different instances and seeks to place legislation on an appropriation bill, and even to amend laws which this Congress has written.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Agriculture has not come to the present chairman of this subcommittee with any such proposal.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You were a member of that committee when we did it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The instant chairman of the subcommittee has made specific recommendations to the chairman of your committee with respect to things that should be done. That is, they were informal, but they were specific, nonetheless.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I have concluded that many of these differences are not going to be resolved, so we might as well proceed.

Now, with regard to the action of this committee, in several instances, certainly, I think we have broken faith with American agriculture. Only last year the distinguished chairman of this committee went on this floor and urged the farmers of this country to plant every available acre, be it thin, be it eroded, whatever its condition was; that the food situation in the United States and throughout the world was so deplorable that the farmers of this Nation should plant every available inch of ground they had into farm products, to help relieve this shortage. There the chairman said, when crops are produced, of course there is another element in there, and that is to conserve the soil:

> I was a little hostile a few years ago, as you may remember, to the Soil Conservation Service, but the more I saw of the world, the erosion, the leaching process, in India, in Ceylon, north Africa, and elsewhere, where people have such difficulty in making sussistence, where people have to work from sunrise to sunset, I got a better appreciation as to what soil, one of the greatest assets of our country really means. So, soil conservation, and also the practice carried on under the Soil Service, and Domestic Allotments, are some of the top functions of the Department.

Then he goes on to urge the farmers to do everything possible toward production of agricultural products regardless of its effect on the soil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman tell them that the gentleman from Illinois has not changed his views about that matter, and then tell them also that they have over a hundred publicity experts in Soil Conservation, over 146 people doing personnel work; and that what the gentleman from Illinois wants to do is to eliminate a lot of waste and extravagance, and if he had had his own way he would have cut it half in two for the purpose of getting at this duplication and waste the gentleman from Illinois pointed out.

Soil Conservation has 12,000 people, the Extension Service has 11,000 people, the Farmers' Home Administration has 9,200 at the farm level. All of them were engaged in some kind of duplication.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the gentleman will admit that he refused and the committee refused to consider the consolidation of supervisory and administrative personnel in those respective agencies so as to get at the basic problem and thereby reduce the cost of the service instead of the service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My good friend belabors me first because to bring about some economy there is legislation in the bill, and then he belabors me again by suggesting that we should rewrite the basic legislation of the agencies involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. What I am attempting to develop is that if he will study the basic legislation in each instance he will find how Congress has outlined the carrying out of the policy for which money is appropriated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Committee on Appropriations could not break down these three large agencies.

Mr. WHITTEN. They could because no legislation is required. Certainly the gentleman would not insist that the Appropriations Committee could not strike out duplications which are not required by law. Then if he could bring a bill such as this which repeals certain basic legislation certainly the gentleman would not argue that such consolidations could not be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman certainly will argue it because you could accomplish it only by a bill making this coordination. The economies we have effected are so designed as not to impair the efficacy of the agencies affected.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman from Illinois, I might say, is one of the most affable but one of the smoothest operators it has ever been my privilege to deal with.

Here is the fact about this matter of soil-conservation payments. It has been represented time and time again here

that this is a payment to individuals, a direct grant from the Government to farmers. The distinguished gentleman from California took that view. I want to call your attention to the fact that these payments are based on and made available for certain work to retain or improve the fertility of land. The more land on which these improved practices can be carried out, the greater the expense to the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. The more land on which these practices are carried out, the more the expense is to the farmer. The farmer must spend on this land $2 out of his own pocket for every one the Federal Government pays for such improved practices. The Federal Government says that for every $2 he puts up the Federal Government will put up one because the Federal Government is interested in the fertility of the soil of this Nation. Each year when this appropriations subcommittee has met, since I have been a member of it, we have made the appropriations for the current year to pay for the Federal Government's contribution to pay for that work, which has been usually three times as much as the Federal contribution will pay for, and we announce the program for the next year. Now, the Department of Agriculture in times past has relied upon that announcement of the program for the next year. The triple-A committees meet that formula, announce what they want the farmers to do, each farmer paying two-thirds of the cost himself, and the farmers would act on it, would expend his funds, and then the succeeding year the Budget Bureau in several instances proceeded to cut down the amount of money necessary to carry out the Federal Government's commitment or to pay for the practices which have been carried out as announced through this committee the preceding year. Last year—I do not see any way in the world to get around this—as a commitment to the American farmer Judge Tarver said: "We are tired of this practice," and he offered an amendment fixing the program for next year at $300,000,000. It is a floor and it is a ceiling and, he said, "I offer it so that there can be no misunderstanding of the situation." He said he had submitted it to the committee, which would include the gentleman from Illinois and my Republican colleagues on the committee, and stated, "I offer it as a committee amendment." The exact proceedings are as follows:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Committee amendment offered by Mr. Tarver: On page 48, lines 21 to 23, strike out all the language within the parentheses and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'amounting to $300,000,000, including administration.' "

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop-year 1947 program, $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicitly so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.

I may say that I have submitted this amendment to the members of the subcommittee and it is, therefore, offered as a committee amendment, since it met with their approval.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wish to see if I thoroughly understand the amendment. The bill as now written puts on a ceiling of $300,000,000 for next year.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand it, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment we have in effect approved $300,000,000 for next year without either putting it up or down; in other words, it is a kind of floor as well as ceiling.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 62, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

It will be noted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that not a single objection was raised by any member of this subcommittee to this amendment nor to Mr. Tarver's statement. It may be stated without any chance of contradiction that the American farmer was told by the Congress, as was the Department of Agriculture, that $300,000,000 would be used to pay the Federal Government's share of this program for this calendar year, funds for which are provided in this bill. Notwithstanding this commitment, notwithstanding the fact that the payments have already been earned, this bill reduces from $300,000,000 to $165,000,000 the sum available to meet this commitment.

This commitment was acted on by the Department of Agriculture, programs were announced providing for expenditure of these funds, and promises were made to the American farmer that if they would spend this money from their own pockets and do this work that the funds would be available. Now it is said that since the Republican members of this committee are faced with the necessity of cutting out essential money from this appropriation bill that in the announcement to the farmers a statement was made in fine print that insofar as money is available the money will be paid. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this language meant that if the farmer signed up and spent his money in such program so that the Government's one-third would be more than $300,000,000 that, of course, the farmer knew he would not be repaid except the pro rata share of the $300,000,000 to offset the cost which he had been put to in carrying out such programs. Certainly there can be no more definite showing where agriculture and the farmers of the Nation stand with the Republican Party than in this absolute failure of the Republican Party to carry out this commitment, as I have heretofore described.

There is one other thing here which I think is deplorable, and that is the repeal of section 32 funds. Throughout the years we have through high tariffs protected those in the industrial fields. We have enacted the minimum wages and hours law, and as long as organized labor can protect itself through the power of its bargaining, just so long it is going to be necessary to provide some protection to those who happen to be engaged in agriculture in this country. We must do that.

Under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act 30 percent of the customs revenue that this Government collected because it let competitive agricultural commodities come into this country to help handle the surpluses that might grow up in this Nation is set aside for agriculture to handle surpluses. I say to you in the last 10 years funds from section 32 have been used to bail out, true, the farmers in my cotton South, but if you will study the record you will find this is not a local problem or that local groups have received the major part of the benefits. It has spread over the entire United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you that in the last 10 years these funds which under the basic law belonged to agriculture have been used to bail out the wheat farmers in the West, it has been used to bail out the fruit producers in the country of the gentleman from California. These funds have been used for the following purposes:

To help the producers of poultry products, $81,699,000.

To help producers of fruit, $146,016,000.

For producers of grain, $180,610,000.

For the dairy farmer, $125,097,000.

To move surplus cotton, $154,080,000.

For producers of meat and meat products, $71,872,000.

For the growers of nuts, $25,195,000.

To move surplus tobacco, $10,424,000.

To purchase vegetables from distressed vegetable producers, $120,896,000.

To the growers of miscellaneous crops, $19,745,000.

To provide cheap milk and lunches for the school children of America, $204,312,000.

The deplorable thing about this situation is that the gentleman from Illinois has never had any sympathy with this basic legislation and has so expressed himself time and time again that they should come to the Appropriations Committee for appropriations and they should not be entitled to these funds which come in because foreign agricultural products are allowed to compete with the products of American agriculture.

I say that if in this bill they are permitted to repeal section 32, the tragedy of it is not only that you will have to go before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture for appropriations to try to carry on this very wonderful work, but in view of the attitude as shown herein in regard to agricultural appropriations and as today expressed in this agricultural appropriation bill, you can tell in advance what the outcome is going to be when you go before that subcommittee, and I say to you that these funds under the basic law belong to agriculture and should be set up on the books to their credit and they should be made available in the years to come when they are going to have surpluses so that those surpluses will not pile up to destroy the market of the American people.

I would like to point out one other thing to you gentlemen, that while on the face of it it may look like you are saving money, and it may be that you can claim credit for having saved it and that you can use it for this tax reduction bill that you want to pass, but I will say as long as you have the Commodity Credit Corporation and as long as you guarantee a loan on the purchase of commodities at 90 percent of parity, I say a removal of section 32 funds may result, Mr. MURRAY, in the Government purchasing more and more and more of the surplus products of this country and in effect cost your Government money instead of saving money, and I believe that is a sound analysis of what this action may mean.

We, in Congress, must realize that although it is the declared objective of the Federal Government to complete the job of rural electrification, the Federal Government does not build and operate lines, it merely guides and stimulates local groups who are accomplishing this stated national objective. There is no way to force the local REA already operating to extend its lines. Those of us in Congress who have maintained close touch with the rural-electrification program know, however, that there exists between the REA and its borrowers a close, cordial, cooperative relationship which is bringing rural America closer and closer to the realization of that objective.

The committee has recommended provision of $225,000,000 in loan funds for fiscal 1948. While I commend this action, I am forced to point out that this provision loses much of its value unless we equip REA with the funds it needs to carry on its work. The committee proposal to reduce drastically the REA administrative fund would require substantial abandonment of the established, proven pattern of operations, and would seriously curtail the program of taking electricity to all farm people in the quickest, most efficient manner possible, and, even more important, on a self-liquidating basis.

I hope that you will support our amendment to restore these funds and assist us in seeing that the REA program is not retarded.

One of the great legislative acts passed by this Congress was the Hope-Flannagan Act providing for research in the field of utilization and marketing of Agricultural products. Under this bill the sum of $9,500,000 was authorized for research in the field of marketing and utilization of products for the fiscal year 1947; and the sum of $19,000,000 was authorized for the fiscal year 1948, the year for which this present appropriation is being made. No funds were secured for the present year and thus under the authorizing legislation $19,000,000 is authorized available for the next year for this great field. As I have stated back in February it was announced by the leaders of this subcommittee that it was believed that we could get by without appropriating any funds for the next fiscal year. However, so many people were interested and the reaction to such statement was so great that the majority members of the committee finally appropriated $6,000,000 for this research program. This is a great deal better than no funds at all but it is my belief, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the splendid results we have gotten for the funds expended in research for production that certainly $9,500,000 should be made available for this program and at the appropriate time we plan to offer an amendment to increase this appropriation by $3,500,000. Certainly in the years ahead I want it to be said that we clearly foresaw that there would be surpluses of agricultural products and that we as a Congress had tried to learn new uses for those products and learn how to market those products to the best advantage. I am afraid that the majority members of this committee will in the years to come have cause to regret their failure to make adequate provision for this program.

Mr. Chairman, a review of this bill will show that regardless of what the Republican members of the committee may say, the only reduction in personnel required is a limit that may be placed on people in information services, where the total is fixed at 250.

Mr. Chairman, of the $381,000,000 reduction provided in this bill, I subscribe to much of the reduction if it were properly applied instead of left to the Department. However, there are some programs vital to the welfare of agriculture that are eliminated, some practically ruined and others drastically reduced. Of course, I do not subscribe to such action.

In at least five particulars this bill is short-sighted and almost tragic, and at the proper time we expect to offer amendments to correct such provisions.

First. Section 32 of the laws of 1935, as amended, is repealed for 1 year.

Second. Soil-conservation payments are cut almost in half—after they have been earned and in direct violation of the action of this Congress last year.

Third. The administrative funds of the Rural Electrification Administration are reduced by one-third.

Fourth. Inadequate funds are provided for research in utilization and marketing of agricultural products.

Fifth. The tenant-purchase funds of the Farmers' Home Administration are completely eliminated and funds so essential for administering the $800,000,000 now owed is drastically reduced below the point of good business.

Gentlemen, when this rule was adopted this morning, my friends on the left determined that they were going to let the most affable, the most able and one of the smoothest men I ever knew, with whom it is a pleasure to serve, determine the agricultural policy of his party, and I say in this bill he is doing a mighty good job of determining it, and if these provisions that are legislative stay in this bill, he has done a good job of saying today that agriculture is not in the bag for the Republicans but that the farmers of this Nation must look to the other side of the aisle for protection as they have learned they had to do in the past few years. It has made me realize the importance of having the Democratic Party in power as much as I have opposed some of its policies, because there agriculture and the people engaged in the industry stand high in the party councils and they will never be sold short as is being done here today under this bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I surely do not care to get into a political agricultural argument. It takes me most of my time to keep out of them. I had a memorandum prepared and intended to give it as a 1-minute speech this morning. The heading is, "Steagall support prices are the bills of rights for the American farmer." After what I have heard today, I am not too sure that we should talk about agriculture. We should probably inject politics along in with it. There is too much politics and not enough agriculture in the air here today.

I take the position that so far as agriculture is concerned it has not been on a parity-income basis since 1922, and that things were not too rosy, the seventh year of the more abundant life or in 1939. I claim that the agricultural prices for 1939 show that we were just about in the same position in 1939 as we were in 1932, the year that is so dear to our friends' hearts. With that in mind I have taken a page out of the August 1939 Agricultural Prices. This indicates that they are absolute facts and authentic.

What do I find? I find that in August 1939 this seventh year of the more abundant life, when wheat was 54 cents a bushel, they were paying 27 cents-per-bushel export subsidy to get rid of it. Wheat was only 49 percent of parity the seventh year of the more abundant life. Corn was 57 percent of parity, and rye was 38 percent of parity. Well, of course, they helped the rye business along quite a little because at a time when rye was bringing 58 percent of parity they lowered the duty by 20 percent and put an embargo on wheat. I do not know how anybody in the South or anybody else can be satisfied with the price set-up in 1939 so far as agriculture is concerned. Here is cotton bringing 56 percent of parity or 8.6 cents a pound.

In other words, my contention is, regardless of the 28 bills that our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] says have been passed in the name of King Cotton, that the Steagall amendment fundamentally, is really the farmer's bill of rights. Day after day it grieves me to see the support program so badly administered. If this support program is not administered with common sense, yes, and nonpolitically and nonsectionally, public opinion will bring it to an end in spite of what its supporters may wish.

The Steagall amendment was not necessarily a political, partisan affair, either, because that amendment had rather unanimous support, as the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] can verify. I think once in a while it might be well for our colleagues to remember that pretty much of the agriculture of this country centers around Chicago as the capital, and that a dozen States around Chicago do a large share of the food producing that is going on in the United States. Outside of Texas and California, there are very few States that can or do feed themselves.

I do not care to get into the political part of it, as I say. We can talk about giving a man $4 for a soil check or $7 for one, but, after all, what makes the difference is what he gets at the end of the month for his milk check or at the end of the season for his tobacco check, or what he gets for the produce he sells from his farm. That is a farm program a farmer understands and appreciates.

With all these glowing tributes that have been given to the present administration, I should like to call your attention to the fact that right today milk prices in my State have gone down 40 percent. Why is this, and why has this been allowed to happen? I have not seen anybody worrying about that. My contention is that the support price for milk and some of its products are not being supported in keeping with the Steagall amendment nor its intent.

If we can get the Commodity Credit Corporation and get the people in the high places to really support legal, lawful price—and I might say the record of this administration has not been too good in the past in connection with the Steagall amendment—many of the worries of American agriculture will be eliminated. It is not any wonder that pork is high when in 1943 and 1944 they let hogs sell below 60 percent of parity, contrary to law. They let eggs go much below 90 percent of parity. I say as far as agricultural production is concerned we have to live up to the support price as provided in the Steagall amendment. That is No. 1. That, together with the high rate of employment in the United States, is the best agricultural program this country has had or, in my opinion, ever will have.

My memorandum and official table are:

STEAGALL SUPPORT PRICES ARE THE BILL OF RIGHTS TO THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. Chairman, the agriculture prices from 1930 to 1940 were very low. By 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, the whole agriculture program had bogged down in spite of the billions of dollars that had been spent on a few crops representing less than one-third of American agriculture. With 10,000,000 people still unemployed, the relationship between the pay rolls of the country and agriculture prices was most apparent.

The greatest influence on farm prices in America today and yesterday is and was the size of the pay rolls of the Nation. Satisfactory agricultural prices require high employment at good wages.

The war not only put the labor in the factory to work, but also the labor on the farm to work as well. The war prevented the huge losses that the CCC was apparently going to face.

The following page from the official Agricultural Prices of the United States Department of Agriculture indicates what agriculture prices can be expected with an unemployment list of 10,000,000 in our country.

*United States Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Marketing Service—United States prices received by farmers, percentage of parity* [1]

| Commodity | 1938 | | | | | 1939 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Aug. 15 | Sept. 15 | Oct. 15 | Nov. 15 | Dec. 15 | Jan. 15 | Feb. 15 | Mar. 15 | Apr. 15 | May 15 | June 15 | July 15 | Aug. 15 |
| | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Wheat | 45 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 48 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 57 | 56 | 50 | 49 |
| Corn | 60 | 59 | 51 | 49 | 53 | 56 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 60 | 62 | 59 | 57 |
| Oats | 40 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 49 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 59 | 59 | 53 | 51 |
| Barley | 44 | 45 | 46 | 44 | 47 | 49 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 46 | 45 |
| Rye | 35 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 37 | 36 | 36 | 40 | 43 | 38 | 38 |
| Buckwheat | 71 | 64 | 59 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 60 |
| Flaxseed | 72 | 74 | 76 | 74 | 77 | 80 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 75 | 76 | 65 | 64 |
| Rice | 61 | 54 | 57 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 59 | 57 |
| Cotton | 52 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 53 |
| Cottonseed | 75 | 74 | 78 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 79 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 73 | 58 |
| Potatoes [2] | 61 | 55 | 59 | 63 | 72 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 88 | 75 | 71 | 89 | 81 |
| Sweetpotatoes | 78 | 65 | 57 | 53 | 58 | 63 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 83 |
| Peanuts | 56 | 52 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| Apples | 62 | 64 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 78 | 79 | 81 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 74 | 55 |
| Butterfat [3] | 77 | 75 | 72 | 71 | 75 | 72 | 74 | 66 | 64 | 68 | 72 | 71 | 73 |
| Chickens | 98 | 99 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 97 | 93 | 95 | 92 |
| Eggs [3] | 89 | 90 | 83 | 74 | 68 | 55 | 61 | 79 | 79 | 76 | 74 | 79 | 75 |
| Hogs | 85 | 88 | 79 | 79 | 76 | 76 | 79 | 78 | 72 | 70 | 65 | 69 | 61 |
| Beef cattle | 96 | 98 | 96 | 95 | 98 | 102 | 105 | 107 | 108 | 108 | 104 | 102 | 100 |
| Veal calves | 93 | 97 | 97 | 96 | 95 | 98 | 103 | 102 | 99 | 97 | 94 | 95 | 96 |
| Lambs | 88 | 87 | 86 | 92 | 96 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 106 | 108 | 101 | 99 | 95 |
| Tobacco: [2] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flue-cured | 104 | 115 | 136 | 104 | 97 | 79 | | 42 | | | | | 92 |
| Fire-cured | | | | | 93 | 79 | 75 | 75 | 58 | 75 | | | |
| Burley | | | | | 116 | 108 | 87 | | | | | | |
| Maryland | 117 | 86 | 71 | 63 | 81 | | 49 | 39 | 49 | 134 | 123 | 110 | 118 |
| Dark air-cured | | | | | 98 | 89 | 64 | 81 | | | | | |
| Cigar-leaf | | | | | | 124 | 127 | 86 | 80 | 109 | 107 | | |
| Hay | 45 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 45 | 46 |
| Wool | 84 | 81 | 85 | 88 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 85 | 91 | 95 | 94 | 96 |

[1] Subject to revision: Indexes based on revised series will be published currently beginning later in the year.
[2] Base prices are averages for the crop years 1919–28. Taxes and interest not considered in determination of parity prices of commodities when using postwar base.
[3] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Since then the Steagall support program has been put in operation and the most important farm crops and products do have or are at least supposed to have the support guaranteed by law.

The Steagall support is really agriculture's bill of rights. The agriculture bill of rights guaranteed by the law of the land should come first, before any group asks to get a chance to pass their tin cups around and ask for special favors.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to put in the RECORD some information with reference to the use of section 32 funds. There seems to be some misunderstanding about the purposes for which section 32 funds may be used and for which they have been used in the past. Particularly there seems to be the thought in the minds of some Members of Congress that the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used for exactly the same purposes as section 32 funds.

I have before me a letter signed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, written at my request, outlining what the effect would be as far as programs during the coming year are concerned

if section 32 funds are rescinded as provided in this bill. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C. May 27, 1947.*

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in response to your inquiry concerning the effect of the rescission of section 32 funds for the fiscal year 1948 upon the continuance of the programs this Department has been conducting with section 32 funds.

We wish to make it clear to the Congress that if section 32 funds are rescinded for the fiscal year 1948, the Department's programs for the purchase and disposal of surplus agricultural commodities—other than the Steagall commodities for which price support is mandatory—will be discontinued. The most effective outlet for perishable commodities is by donation to welfare agencies and school-lunch programs. Such donations are specifically authorized in carrying out section 32 programs. Commodity Credit Corporation, however, has not been expressly authorized by the Congress to dispose of perishable commodities by donation to relief agencies and school-lunch programs. In fact, the corporation has not throughout the history of its operations ever made donations of commodities acquired by it. The Commodity Credit Corporation operations have in the main been restricted to storable commodities which can be carried through periods of surplus production for marketing at times when supplies are not in surplus. For this reason, Commodity Credit Corporation has not, except where the program was mandatory, carried out price support operations with respect to nonstorable commodities.

In the circumstances Commodity Credit Corporation would not feel warranted in undertaking perishable commodity programs which would involve virtually a total loss of the amount of money expended without express prior authorization of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
*Under Secretary.*

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have never been able to keep track of these section 32 funds very well. I would like to know who determines when, how, and why they are to be used the way they are.

Mr. HOPE. Under the provisions of the law it is left to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether the funds or any part of them are to be used for the particular purposes that are set out in the law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He has the decision as to where and what foods are bought? Is that right?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; within the limits of the law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As the gentleman has well pointed out, section 32, as we refer to it and as the gentleman has referred to it, is a continuing appropriation, and as such permanent law it is related to other programs that are authorized, including the legislation authorizing the imposition of import quotas and export subsidies. But to justify the imposition of import quotas or export subsidies, there must first be a program, and without section 32 funds in the case of wheat and corn and many other commodities, no program is authorized by any other law. So it is essential for a program to be authorized if section 32 is to be eliminated and section 32 is essential to be continued if there is to be a program for cotton, wheat, corn, and other similar products.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As I understand, they use these funds and they get new uses for agricultural products. Is that right?

Mr. HOPE. That is one of the purposes for which the fund may be used.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And it is not only on an experimental basis, but they are making a business out of it; is that right?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that Mr. Ford, for example, uses an average of 32 pounds of cotton bats in each car and he gets 4 cents a pound subsidies? He is getting a $1.28 subsidy on every car that he produces. That has been set up as a permanent program and has been in operation for several years.

Mr. HOPE. There is a program to utilize low-quality cotton. I presume that is the program to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman give his opinion on the effect of these cuts in appropriations on the land-grant colleges and the Hope-Flannagan bill? I have a communication from the Colorado State Agricultural College in which they have indicated to me that the Colorado Legislature has appropriated its share of the fund for the Hope-Flannagan bill. I wonder if you have had an opportunity to analyze what it will mean to the land-grant colleges and to the Hope-Flannagan bill generally.

Mr. HOPE. I am up to date on what the various States have done toward meeting the matching requirements. Some of the State legislatures are still in session. Others have recently adjourned So I am not familiar with what has been done. Of the $6,000,000 that was appropriated, $3,000,000 has been appropriated specifically for the purpose of going to the State experiment stations, to be matched by the States. I do not know whether the States have provided more money than is sufficient to match the Federal funds or not. I have no information on that point. I might say to the gentleman that I am somewhat disappointed that the bill does not provide at least $9,500,000 which would be the first year's increment of funds under this measure, but I believe that with the $6,000,000 appropriation a start can be made in this program, which I firmly believe is one of the most important that has ever been undertaken in the field of agriculture.

At this point Mr. Chairman, I want to outline the purposes for which section 32 funds are available and to point out some of the ways in which they have been used in the past:

The funds appropriated by section 32 are available, first, to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits or indemnities; second, to encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization among persons in the low-income groups; and, third, to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption.

The act of June 28, 1937, as amended—Fifteenth United States Code, 1940 edition, supplement 5, 713c—provides that in carrying out clause (2) of section 32, that is, encouraging domestic consumption by diverting from the normal channels of trade and commerce, agricultural commodities and products thereof may be purchased and donated for relief purposes. Section 9 of the School Lunch Act authorizes the donation of commodities purchased with section 32 funds to schools carrying out the school-lunch program or other institutions authorized to receive such commodities.

Under section 32, programs have been carried out for the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables and other perishable agricultural commodities where such action was necessary to relieve price-depressing surpluses or to carry out the obligation of the Department to support the price of such commodities under the so-called Steagall amendment. The authority and funds provided by section 32 are used in such cases, because the most effective means of disposing of the commodities was by donation for relief purposes and to the school-lunch programs which is expressly authorized by the act of June 28, 1937, as amended, referred to above. As a general rule, surplus-removal programs with respect to perishable commodities are undertaken only where a known outlet exists, such as the school-lunch program, welfare agencies, and so forth. During the fiscal year—1947—approximately $20,000,000 worth of surplus vegetables alone have been purchased with section 32 funds. It is true that large surpluses, such as occurred during the late thirties, do not exist at the moment which need to be removed from the market. It is not possible, however, to accurately predict when surpluses may arise. Thus there existed even during the most critical period of food shortages in this country during and after the war, local gluts of agricultural products, particularly perishables, such as green beans, spinach, cabbage, carrots, citrus, and other fruits. These local surpluses were removed with purchases made from section 32 funds. The Department was not only able to afford

farmers in the local surplus areas badly needed price protection, but was also able to save badly needed food, which otherwise would have been wasted, by donating such food to welfare agencies and the school-lunch program.

Commodity Credit Corporation has not been expressly authorized by the Congress to donate commodities for relief purposes or to the school lunch program, and the Corporation has not during the 14 years of its existence ever made any such donation. In fact, Commodity Credit Corporation is expressly prohibited by law from disposing of any commodity below parity except under specified circumstances. In the case of a nonperishable commodity, sales below parity may be made if the commodity has substantially deteriorated; in the case of a perishable commodity, sales below parity may be made where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage. In certain circumstances it may be difficult to determine that there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage so as to authorize CCC to dispose of perishable commodities below parity.

Inasmuch as CCC lacks express statutory authorization to make donation of perishable commodities and has not during the entire history of its operations ever made such donations, the rescission by Congress of the funds and authority which have been used for the purchase of surpluses perishable commodities which can effectively be disposed of through donation to welfare agencies and schools would seem to indicate that Congress intended that such operations, where they were not mandatory, should be discontinued until section 32 funds and authority were restored—even assuming the existence of technical legal authority in CCC to purchase perishable commodities to support the price.

The rescission of section 32 will also force a termination of the Department's marketing abundant foods program, marketing-facilities program, and food-preservation program, which are carried out with such funds. Under the marketing abundant foods program the Department has encouraged the domestic consumption of surplus agricultural commodities by seeking to increase the marketing of such commodities through the usual food outlets, such as retail grocers, restaurants, hotels, and so forth. Under the marketing-facilities program the Department has sought to increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by assisting in the development and improvement of marketing facilities in order to speed the flow of agricultural commodities from the producer to the consumer. Under the food-preservation program the Department has provided technical assistance and has promoted the canning of millions of cans of fresh fruits and vegetables during the periods of peak production, which would otherwise have been wasted.

Section 32 funds are used to pay export subsidies. While CCC has the authority to dispose of agricultural commodities or cause them to be disposed of at competitive world prices, its export programs have related to the disposition of stocks of commodities acquired by the Corporation in connection with its support-price operations. CCC does not have any stocks of cotton available to conduct an export program. Section 32 funds are used where the program does not relate to stocks of cotton held by CCC and a direct subsidy payment is involved.

The act of August 11, 1939—Fifteenth United States Code, 1940 edition, 713c—authorizes section 32 funds to be used for the purpose of diverting surplus fishery products from the normal channels of trade and commerce by acquiring them and provide for their distribution through these channels. That act also authorizes the transfer from section 32 funds to the Secretary of the Interior for use in promoting the free flow of domestically produced fishery products in commerce by conducting a fishery educational service, and to develop and increase markets for fishery products of domestic origin. The rescission of section 32 would terminate these fishery-product operations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] such time as he may desire.

(Mr. ZIMMERMAN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting to the House, H. R. 3601, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, came as a distinct shock to the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be a member, to the farmers of America and to the friends of agriculture.

I am in complete agreement with those who believe that the time has come to practice real economy in government, that a reduction in personnel in the various departments, including the Department of Agriculture, should be made wherever possible and that duplication of work, wherever possible, should be eliminated. However, no one expected the Committee on Appropriations to recommend the drastic, devastating cut of 32 percent for a department which serves the farmers of this Nation. I am sure that no such remommendation has been made for other departments in the Government.

The report of the committee on this bill is indeed very interesting and would indicate a purpose or a policy to reduce the Department of Agriculture to its status when set up in 1862 by a bill passed by Congress and signed by Abraham Lincoln. As an example of the declared policy of this committee, whose sole purpose is to appropriate money, I refer to a statement on page 5 of this report which is not only illuminating but which expresses the attitude of the party in power and this committee which is controlled by that party where it says:

> As we give thought to such a problem as soil conservation and to the saving of the surface of our land from the influence of erosion, we also have the responsibility of pursuing those policies which will prevent the erosion of that rugged individual character which has made the American farmer the greatest producer of agricultural commodities at any time or in any nation in the world's history.

What the committee meant by the term, "erosion of that individual character," it is a little difficult to understand in the light of the words which follow.

Just in what way is the American farmer being eroded, or in what way has he been eroded? We all remember the plight of agriculture back in the years of 1930, 1931, and 1932 when the American farmer was reduced to a state of poverty and bankruptcy. Farm prices were so low that he could not pay interest on his loan, pay the taxes against his land, or support his family.

Under the operation of the political party in power and the high protective tariff which that party sponsored and relied upon, the American farmer at that time truly represented a badly eroded individual. When the Democratic Party came into power in 1933, the first efforts of the administration were to do something for the American farmer. Legislation was enacted and has been enacted since that time to give the farmer a fair price for his commodity, to conserve and build up his soil, and enable him and his family to live in a fair state of decency and comfort. If a program which has brought these benefits to the American farmer is regarded as "the erosion of that rugged individual character," then I am sure the farmers of this country are not in agreement with the policy announced by this committee.

I opposed and voted against the rule adopted by the House today because I felt the adoption of such a rule would enable the Committee on Appropriations to further violate the rules of this House which prohibit the Appropriations Committee from legislating on an appropriation bill. The duty of recommending basic legislation for various objects and purposes is vested in the various legislative committees of the House and the sole duty of the Appropriations Committee is to appropriate money for the objects and purposes authorized by Congress. In this bill, the Appropriations Committee has gone out of its way to legislate on an appropriation bill—some of the most glaring being a virtual repeal of section 32 of the AAA Act passed by Congress more than 10 years ago; a drastic change in the present law providing for the inspection of meat; a change in the law passed for the operation of the Farmers' Home Administration; and a change in the basic law dealing with the operation and financing of rural electrification cooperatives. Under the Reorganization Act adopted by Congress last year, it was made the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend to legislative committees changes in the basic law in connection with matters about which the Committee on Appropriations was called to act. I submit that no recommendation was ever made by this committee to the House Commit-

tee on Agriculture in order that they might take whatever action might be deemed necessary for the amendment or modification of these acts. If this practice is to be tolerated by this House, then the legislative committees of Congress might as well dissolve and their members give their time and attention to other congressional duties.

One of the greatest aids to agriculture in recent years was the enactment of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. The reasons for the enactment of section 32 is well understood. Under the tariff laws which our country had operated, the farmer was compelled to sell his products on a world market at world prices, while he was compelled to buy the things he needed for himself and family and in the operation of his business upon a protective market. In order to place the farmer in a comparable position with industry which enjoyed a protective tariff, it was considered just and fair that a part of the custom receipts should be set aside to stabilize and support agriculture commodities and thereby benefit the American farmer. Under section 32, 30 percent of our custom duties are set aside for what is termed a permanent appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture in disposing of farm surpluses, encouraging domestic consumption and for other highly beneficial programs for agriculture. This act has been in force for more than 10 years and literally millions of dollars have been spent in aid of American agriculture. By its action, this committee seeks to take this fund from the Secretary of Agriculture and to deprive him of the uses for which the fund was created. To permit this to be done would certainly start a real erosion of the American farmer.

In the short time at my disposal, I would like to call attention to one more act of this committee which I think renders a distinct disservice to American agriculture. We all know that our soil is one of our Nation's most valuable resources, and its conservation should be one of the chief concerns of our Government. Since this program was inaugurated, we have made great progress, and we are now beginning to reap dividends from the investment made in this program. The great pity is that we did not embark upon such a program sooner. To stop spending money for the strengthening of our soil is a good deal like stopping medicine and food for a sick man, and I shall support an amendment to this bill at the proper time and place to provide adequate funds for this program.

Mr. Chairman, rural electrification has done more to brighten the homes of rural America than anything Congress has ever authorized and set up. The farmers of our Nation want and need this service and no reduction should be made for the support of this program. Our cooperatives have made prompt payments on all loans granted them for the establishment and expansion of this program, and we should make available the necessary funds to give the farmers of America this service at the earliest possible date.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention again to the action of this committee in regard to our school lunch program set up by Congress last year. Strong people as well as strong and fertile land make a strong nation, and no program inaugurated by this Congress has done more to build a strong, healthier citizenship than has our school lunch program. I recall that during the consideration of this bill last year General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, stated that more than 40 percent of the young men of our country who were called to serve our country during World War II were found physically unfit for duty due largely to malnutrition during childhood and youth. Money invested in building a strong, virile manhood and womanhood is money well spent and is in reality an investment for the future. At the proper time and place I shall support an amendment to this bill to increase the amount recommended for this program, which is a serious reduction over the needs, and also to eliminate the restrictive language that has been coupled with the meager appropriation made by this committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to several provisions of this bill which would be detrimental to the welfare of American agriculture. The provisions are those relating to soil conservation, the school-lunch program, price supports and surplus removal, rural electrification, and loans to small farmers.

Soil conservation takes a double blow in this bill. The first is aimed at the agricultural-conservation program, and the other is directed at the work of the Soil Conservation Service.

In passing the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947, the Congress clearly pledged farmers a $300,000,000 agricultural-conservation program for this year. The language of the bill and the debate on it, March 8, 1946, permit no doubt of that fact.

The bill this year would repudiate that pledge and cut payments to farmers nearly in half. This action comes after—not before—a majority of farmers have carried out the practices for which payments are authorized. How can the Department of Agriculture handle this situation? It cannot do so fairly. It can pay on a first-come-first-served basis, which is unfair. Or it can try to collect part of the payments already made—in other words, put those farmers on the debt register.

The bill goes further. It would kill the program completely at the end of this year, repudiating the accepted principle that the public shares responsibility with the farmer for bearing the cost of conserving the soil resources on which civilization depends.

Let it be known, too, that killing the ACP wipes out the elected, nonpartisan farmer-committee system which helps formulate and administer agricultural programs. This weakens the commodity loan system and other programs. The Nation will thus lose an important means of achieving economic democracy. I plead with the House to keep its pledge for this year and to maintain the ACP next year at the level recommended by the President.

As if the blow at the agricultural conservation program and the farmer-committee system were not enough, the bill takes another cut at the Nation's soil-conservation effort. By cutting down the Soil Conservation Service, it will reduce when it should increase the value of the soil-conservation districts which the people have set up under State laws in every State of the Union.

They have gone through the long and often tedious legal process of establishing more than 1,800 soil-conservation districts because they want to do an effective job of soil conservation. The farmers run these districts themselves.

Almost every one of these districts has asked the Soil Conservation Service to provide it with technical assistance. The farmers recognize that expert assistance on an acre-by-acre basis is essential if we are to get permanent conservation. They want it. They ought to have it. They know they would not be faced with the terrific soil-erosion problem they face today if they had had this kind of expert help in the past.

If we cut the funds for the SCS, we are cutting down the scientific assistance to the farmers in soil-conservation districts. Some of the new districts will probably get no help at all.

I cannot believe this House wants to reduce this scientific and widely praised soil-conservation work. I hope this House will allow the full budget estimate of $44,860,000 for the Soil Conservation Service.

What the bill does to the school-lunch program is to reduce by considerably more than 50 percent the nearly $63,000,000 allocated to the States for food purchases this year. It also changes the matching provisions so that many States might not be able to receive the full amounts provisionally available for them under the new appropriation proposal. Payments by those children who can afford to pay for their share of the lunch costs could no longer be included in the totals of State "matching" money.

In some States, the amounts that would be available for school-lunch operations next year would be so small as to raise serious doubts about the continuance of the program on any basis.

Now a word about section 32 funds. Elimination of these funds, the equivalent of 30 percent of the previous year's customs receipts, would deprive farmers of protection against emergency situations in various commodities.

We need these funds to deal with local surpluses of perishable commodities, such as fruits and vegetables. We have such local surpluses somewhere every year. We have some now. We will have more. Without section 32 money, it would be impossible to put a practical floor under temporarily glutted fruit and vegetable markets.

The Government should have continuing access to these funds so as to make exports possible when certain farm products otherwise will not move in world

trade. The funds have been invaluable in eliminating the cotton surpluses, for example.

We especially need to maintain section 32 in order to cushion the impact of price-depressing factors on the farm economy. We also need it in developing new uses, diverting some products to byproduct uses, and in getting supplies of food and fiber to the needy.

In the rural electrification field, the effect of the bill can be stated very clearly and concisely. It would deprive 135,000 farm families of electric light and power they could just as well have in the year ahead. This would be the direct effect of the bill in decreasing the funds which REA needs to do engineering and other work which must precede the extension of power lines. Do not slow down or stop this service which is second in importance only to the RFD service to the farmers.

The committee bill is especially hard on the small farmer who is short on resources. In calling for complete elimination of direct loans for farm purchase, the bill would order that deserving and qualified applicants—including veterans—be denied the opportunity to buy farms of their own. The demand for these loans has increased steadily, especially from veterans. On December 31, 1946, applications from 36,340 veterans were on file, as compared with 7,705 on the same date a year earlier. By denying these loans, the Department loses an effective weapon against farm land-price inflation, since these farms are purchased on a long-time earning capacity appraisal. And the bill would completely nullify section 505b, Public Law 346—the GI bill of rights.

The bill also would reduce funds for production and subsistence loans by $30,000,000. This means that many eligible applicants, including veterans, would be denied the only source of credit suitable to successful operations on their farms. With loan funds exhausted in most States, 14,600 of the veteran applications are still on file. To date, loans have been made to approximately 50,000 World War II veterans, and it would be discriminatory to refuse similar aid to other veteran applicants who filed too late to receive aid from past appropriations.

The committee bill would reduce funds for salaries and expenses by $12,000,000 and thus reduce the technical assistance to borrowers that frequently spells the difference between success and failure on these loans. There are now 1,200,000 borrowers with outstanding accounts of $700,000,000. FHA would have to close about 575 county offices, and increase the workload of remaining county personnel beyond the point where adequate assistance can be rendered borrowers.

I could cite other faults in this bill including the failure to provide funds to put into effect the scientific approach to the problems of distribution authorized by the Research and Marketing Act. However, this is merely a failure to advance the cause of agriculture and the general welfare whereas the cuts I have discussed represent absolute regression—positive detriment to American agriculture. The bill as it stands provides for an appropriation that is too low and a cost that is too high for the Nation to afford. I plead with you: Do not start us back on the road to soil destruction and depression.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

(Mr. EVINS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill being considered here today will cut and reduce the recommended budget for the Department of Agriculture by $383,000,000 less than recommended by President Truman. Should this action be approved the Congress will in effect be cutting the heart from a sound and progressive agricultural program designed to bring about a self-sustaining American agriculture and a manifestation and development of this Nation's agricultural resources.

The economies proposed in this measure are to the detriment of the farmers of our country and all segments of our population. The bill drastically curtails the services of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmer's Home Administration, the National School Lunch Program, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Production and Marketing Administration, and various branches of the Department of Agriculture concerned with Scientific research and agricultural development and extension. I am in favor of economy—"constructive economy"—by eliminating waste and extravagance and useless personnel and have voted for measures in this session of the Congress to effect such economies where I felt that such could be accomplished without impairing vital and essential Government services. However, the drastic cuts that are here proposed, in my humble opinion, constitute a glaring example of false economy which is manifestly unfair not only to our farmers and the agricultural population of our country but also to every segment of our citizenship who are depending upon a successful and prosperous agriculture in America. Should American agriculture fail through the lack of coordination and support, all dreams of future prosperity and international peace may well end in chaos and confusion. The drastic reductions in appropriations proposed for the Soil Conservation Service exemplify a virtual wrecking of the soil conserving programs which is false economy in the truest sense. Our farms and tillable agriculture soil constitute the basic wealth of our country. Department of Agriculture statisticians estimate that between 1895 and 1930 a full million acres of top soil were lost each year and that more than 50 percent of the country's farm lands have been damaged by wind or water erosion and that this loss to the Nation has been about $4,000,000,000 a year. Since 1930, under the Soil Conservation Programs through contour planting and cultivation, terracing and various other soil conserving and erosion preventing practices, the wastage of our lands has been greatly reduced. Although the expenditures for soil conservation may appear to be great they are trivial compared to the ultimate gains which may accrue under these programs.

The majority membership of the Appropriations Committee has eliminated entirely all of the work heretofore performed by members of various county ACA committees in assisting farmers in statements of performance of prescribed conservation practices under which payments are conditioned. This elimination of assistance, basic in the field where most needed, is unjustified and constitutes an example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. We cannot afford to let soil conservation slip back to a haphazard and unassisted condition contrary to the welfare and well-being of the present and future of America. This program is extensive and covers assistance in crop stripping, irrigation, cover cropping, restoration of eroded fields, terracing, draining, contouring, and other soil-conservation practices. Participating in the program are nearly 4,000,000 of the approximately 6,000,000 farms in the Nation.

The same situation and general principle applies as respects the programs of the Production and Marketing Administration as applied to cotton and tobacco production; to the Federal crop-insurance program which assures the investment of our farmer in his crop, and in the triple-A and Commodity Credit price-support programs as well as the Rural Electrification Administration, all of which aid in composing a well-balanced farm program.

Mr. Chairman, we want to maintain a well-balanced and profitable agriculture, and I urge that prior to the passage of this bill that amendments be adopted reinstating necessary funds which have been deleted, thereby providing for a continued strong and successful agriculture in America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

(Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country have just begun to get their heads above water, and it seems to me that the Appropriations Committee has reported an appropriation bill to the House that will sink the farmers again. I feel that I am well qualified to speak on this subject, since I was born and reared on a farm and at a time when the farmers received only a very small percentage of what their produce was worth.

Through well thought out legislation by the Congress the Government has been in a position during the past 10 years to materially assist the farmer in getting what he is justly entitled to receive for his produce. The pending agriculture appropriation bill practically eliminates several items materially affecting the farmers.

First, the transfer of the Federal inspection fee from the Government to the packer only adds more expense as we all know that the packers will pass this additional expense on to the farmers.

The REA has just begun to recuperate from the war as it was impossible for this

organization to secure copper wire and other strategic materials to give the farmers the benefit of electric service during the critical war days. I sincerely hope the House will amend the present bill tomorrow when amendments are in order so that the REA funds will not be imperiled, also the fine work carried on by the REA cooperatives throughout the United States can continue uninterrupted. I sincerely hope that I will live long enough to see every farm home in the United States have electric service which will also mean that they can have water works and all other conveniences afforded the people who reside in cities.

Funds for the Farm Security Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, and other important items such as the AAA have been considerably curtailed under the pending bill. I shall vote for amendments to have sufficient funds included in this bill to carry on the above named farm activities so that our farmers can continue to progress and not go backward. We are headed directly for another depression if we pass the pending legislation in its present form. Every Member of the House recognizes the fact that the farms are the backbone of our country and if they fail our entire economy is bound to fail.

We cannot continue to expect our farmers to operate at a loss and on the other hand guarantee industry a 10 percent profit on their investments and also continue to grant labor increased wages.

It is beyond my wildest imagination to understand how anyone could think we are economizing in Government expenses by curtailing the activities of the farmers and preventing them from having the tools necessary to raise food and other produce so necessary for not only our country but the entire world. We are sending billions of tons of food to every section of the world and it seems that we will be called on to feed the majority of the people of the world during the next few years.

We have recently made two or three huge appropriations to take care of suffering people in foreign countries and assist them in getting their governments back into operation. Therefore, I cannot understand why we should try to take away the few advantages we have recently granted our farmers under the name of economy.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere wish that we can amend the present appropriation bill when amendments are in order to the extent that every dollar the President has requested for the farmer shall be appropriated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the distinguished gentlemen who are the authors of this appropriation bill, and I congratulate them for their splendid efforts to effect economy into the agricultural operations of our country. But I must remind them that the road to hell, also, is paved with good intentions, and it is my thought that false economy is more expensive in the long run than no attempts at economy.

During my brief period of tenure in this House I have heard repeated tributes to the superhuman job on the part of organized labor in producing the weapons of war with which our soldiers were able to repel the enemy; I have heard repeated tributes to American business enterprises for their splendid production efforts during the war; I have heard innumerable tributes and eulogies to our patriotic sons who fought and bled on foreign battlefields so that our Nation might continue to be the greatest nation on the face of the earth. These tributes are well founded, and their recipients are entitled to all the credit and praise that a grateful people might bestow upon them.

But our Nation has become great and remained great through the combined efforts of all of her peoples, and though I have yet in this Congress to hear of such lavish praise heaped upon the farmers of our country, nevertheless, without his contribution to the war effort, we would have been lost. It was he who labored through endless hours of back-breaking and thankless toil so that we who were in the service of our country both at home and on foreign soil, and those who worked in the factories to produce the guns would have food to eat and clothing to wear. The American farmer has always been the backbone of our Nation, and we should never stoop so low as to disavow that fact.

And yet, of all those who produced the weapons of war, and those who made it possible for us to weather the storm of the last great conflict, the American farmer has been the least paid and the most self-sustaining. His needs are small, and his demands are few. He receives the least amount of remuneration for his work per dollar invested and man-hour worked of all the trades or professions. And without his efforts we would all perish from the face of this earth.

I favor restoration of the cuts made by the committee in rural electrification appropriations. Nothing has meant more to the rural citizen of America than rural electrification; it has doubled the value of every farm that it has touched, and has brought the comforts of urban life to those who are most entitled to them, the American farmers.

Instead of cutting funds for this great enterprise, I think we should provide more funds in order that it may expand and give more service to more people. It is my dream that someday every farm family in America may be able to enjoy the comforts and benefits of electricity—and until that day comes, I am in favor of enlarging and expanding further this great program initiated for the farmer in recognition of his all-important contribution to American life.

It is an established fact that every living thing derives its subsistence from the top 6 inches of the earth's crust. Without this 6 inches of topsoil mankind would perish from the face of the earth, and vegetation would gradually disappear. Down through the ages of history, this soil has been washed into the valleys, and from there into the streams, and so on into the sea, and it was only after the situation was beginning to become critical that this important fact was discovered, and the science of soil conservation came into being. And today, through the efforts of our experts in the soil-conservation field who are working with those in the Triple A and other agricultural divisions, we are making rapid and noticeable progress in checking the loss of this fertility from our soils. One needs but to ride for 30 minutes from this city to see the results of this program.

The other day this Congress appropriated three hundred and fifty millions of our American dollars to be used to purchase food grown by American farmers to feed the starving people of Europe. We were drawing on our own dwindling resources to supply food for people who, through ignorance and neglect, failed to conserve their own natural resources for such emergencies, and who today are suffering because of the depletion and waste of these resources.

We seem to have plenty of money to send to Europe—but not enough to spend on our own future welfare. I cannot agree with such two-faced logic.

I want to see the section 32 funds restored to the farmers of America to whom they rightfully belong, and to see adequate funds given to our forestry and extension services and our school-lunch program.

Amendments to this bill will be offered to correct all of these injustices, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will see fit to restore these funds, at least to conform with the budget of the President.

It is high time that our American farmer assumed his rightful position in this country and ceased to be the scapegoat of every so-called political economy drive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the authors of this report for their expressed appreciation of the importance of forestry to this country. As they point out on page 7 of the report:

> As a matter of fact, more and more, forestry is coming to be regarded as an annual crop with definite cash income benefits to farmers in all sections of the country.

That is very true—outstandingly so in my part of the country.

I want to give further credit to the report for the statement that—

> There is a growing interest in forestry as evidenced by the fact that more than threescore witnesses appeared to testify on one item or another in the Forest Service estimate.

A separate volume of the printed hearings is devoted exclusively to the testimony from scores of witnesses from

both sides of the House. The time and effort devoted by the many members of the House in advocating various forestry measures are indicative of the importance of this subject, not only for the definite cash income benefits mentioned in the report, but also for the many other benefits which flow from a well-done job of forestry. You know what they are. I refer to the flood-control values, to the stabilization of communities were sustained yield forestry is practiced, to the peaceful and delightful recreation provided tens of millions of our city and rural dwellers within our widespread national forest system, and to the stimulating pleasure granted millions of sportsmen by the proper handling of the wildlife—most of which, by all odds, at least in the West, ranges throughout the national forests, and finally to the range forage made available to some 10,000,000 head of livestock which returned to the Treasury far more from national forest grazing fees than is met in administering them.

And now after reading those honeyed words in the report saying that something should be done about the forestry situation, what do we find in terms of definite recommendations? The answer is nothing but cuts in appropriations, excepting for fire protection. Turn to pages 59 and 60 of the report. Item after item after item—11 out of 12—is prefaced with a minus sign. That sort of double talk will do much more harm than good. For example, let me mention briefly 6 of the items with which I am personally well acquainted, although they are important not only in my district but Nation-wide:

First. A half-million-dollar cut is made in the project for general management and operation of the national forests. The report—page 19—says this is largely office work. This is the fund from which the forest rangers and forest supervisors are paid. Try following them over the mountains, working on forest fires, on timber sales, handling that 10,000,000 head of livestock, and doing the 101 jobs which we expect them to do. I have made such trips and want to assure you that those are far from being the swivel-chair office jobs implied in the committee report. The 8-hour day means nothing to these men during the field season. Overtime, from daylight to dark, but not on an overtime-pay basis, is customary practice. Rather than cutting this item, additional help should be provided these men. The dividend would be great in terms of less acres burned, more timber cut, and in other beneficial ways.

Second. Within the present month, Mr. TABER's deficiency committee recommended, and Congress appropriated, an increase of $410,000 to increase the volume of timber sales on the national forests. The reason given was that such expenditures would return some $4 to the Treasury for each dollar spent. Now, this committee not only reverses the action of the Deficiency Committee by denying continuance of the $410,000 increase, but makes a further cut of $190,000 for timber-sale work. We recognized previously that it was a good business proposition to make an investment of this sort. The committee action in proposing this cut is, therefore, incomprehensible.

Third. I have mentioned that most of the big game and wildlife, especially in the West, range over our national forests. This is a valuable national resource which heretofore has been given at least some attention with the $163,000 appropriated for that purpose. Millions of sportsmen can testify to that. It is inconceivable, therefore, why the committee report—page 20—recommends that "the allotment—for the production of wildlife resources in the forests has been eliminated entirely." Note that word "entirely." We can, of course, eliminate the appropriation, but any of you who have been out in our forested country know that you cannot eliminate the hundreds of thousands of deer, elk, bear, antelope, and other game animals, and the many problems which arise because of their very presence. The complete elimination of this item is another of the incomprehensible features of this report.

Fourth. A fourth example—in brief—of the more serious cuts in forestry activities is the 50-percent reduction in forest resource investigations. This is the job of making an inventory of the standing timber in this country; what goods do we have on our shelves? Many a small-town storekeeper as well as the big industrialist realizes that an inventory of goods on hand is indispensable to a successful business. No such inventory is available as yet for large sections of the country. That is the way it is in my own State. Many of us believe that the amount of timber being cut there could be increased by hundreds of millions of board feet annually, and still not reduce the amount of our stocks on hand to a dangerous point. However, without an inventory we will not know if our stocks are being depleted too seriously. The committee report—page 21—says: "The work is largely academic, and lacks in real practical value." The practical woodsmen, the sawmill operators, and woodland owners will sharply challenge that statement. The Forest Service must have done a poor job in explaining to the committee what this project really is.

Fifth. Others will doubtless call to your attention that 35-percent cut in funds for the forest products laboratory and its field stations. The committee report—page 21—characterizes it as "academic or visionary." That was certainly not the reason why the Army and Navy people turned to this laboratory so frequently during the war years; nor the reason why the wood using industries give it their hearty support.

Sixth. Finally, among this list of incomprehensibles is the reduction of $2,500,000 for access roads; roads to make available for cutting hundreds of millions of feet of timber so urgently needed in the present housing crisis. As brought out during the hearings some $7,000,000 of the appropriation for "Forest development roads" is required for necessary maintenance. Consequently the committee report allows only $3,000,000 for new construction of access roads. This will be a reduction of almost 50 percent below the construction program under way this fiscal year. From personal observation I know that this work is being done efficiently and at reasonable cost. The returns to the Treasury from sales of national forest stumpage thus made available will more than liquidate the cost of these roads. With the need for more lumber as desperately great as it is, surely there should be no let-up in the access road construction program. To increase it would be much sounder from a cold dollar-and-cents point of view.

Other items in the Forest Service section of the bill also need further consideration. Quite probably all of them cannot be taken care of adequately at this time. I do wish to urge, however, that the House conferees study the real justification for these items more thoroughly and then join with the Senate conferees in converting the fine introductory words of this section of the report into the funds needed to actually put these words into effect.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if we are not to have another war, this is the most important of the appropriation bills that will be considered at this session of Congress. It has more direct, and immediate, and determining influence upon the national economy than any appropriation bill which will be considered in the Eightieth Congress. Notwithstanding its importance it is being cut nearly one-third lower than any other of the annual supply bills with possibly one exception, and certainly the greatest decrease in service to agriculture under the preceding year of any supply bill in the history of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we are entering upon a critical postwar period. There is a disconcerting similarity in the pattern of the agricultural graphs in every war in which the United States has been engaged; in the rise and fall of farm prices and farm prosperity during and following continental wars, even back to the Napoleonic era.

We observe in each instance an advance with alarming regularity in agricultural prices, agricultural income, and agricultural prosperity during the war, and then a collapse which leaves the country in the depths of a disastrous depression.

That was the situation in 1866, 1899, 1920, and that will be the situation in the readjustment which must inevitably follow this war unless steps can be taken, both legislative and economic, to reverse the trend.

With that in view, Congress has endeavored in the last two decades to provide legislative machinery and economic programs which will counteract the effect of the inexorable law of dislocated supply and demand, so far as its effects upon agricultural deflation and postwar retrogression are concerned.

The system of programs and projects provided for in this bill are the outgrowth of our efforts to achieve price stability, economic equality, and a progressive standard of living for American agriculture. Almost without exception they have been remarkably successful.

They have standardized production and income and have supplied a buying power which has been reflected in the increasing prosperity of business and industry dependent on farm patronage.

For that reason any proposal which threatens the continued activity and effectiveness of this integrated system of supports and controls merits the most earnest and painstaking scrutiny and consideration.

Let us examine briefly, in the order of their discussion in the committee report, some of the activities most drastically affected by the indiscriminate restrictions and liquidations proposed in the pending bill.

That is in keeping with the times. Research has demonstrated its value in peace and war. But for research and the scientific developments which supported our troops in the field, the war would still be on, we would still be fighting—abroad and at home. Industry, quick to realize the dollar-and-cents value of this practical point of view, is making unprecedented allotments of funds for research. It is even more important that agriculture, with its need for new uses and markets and new methods and fields of distribution of agricultural surpluses, should follow suit. Pressing problems of supply, demand, prices, consumption, standardization, transportation, processing, packaging, and distribution require immediate and comprehensive study.

Accordingly, both Houses of Congress last year approved by practically unanimous vote the Hope-Flannagan research bill, and in response to that authorization an estimate was submitted to the House for an appropriation of $19,000,000 for that purpose. The committee, disregarding the mandate of the Congress, cuts the amount to $6,000,000, an amount so small as to render the project practically inoperative.

But perhaps the most disastrous effect of the bill is the denial of funds for the Production and Marketing Administration, generally known as the AAA. It has rendered the greatest service and it sustains the greatest cut of any agency in the bill.

In recognition and appreciation of the importance of the AAA program, Congress passed by an overwhelming majority in both branches authorization.

In the last session of Congress authorization was made by an overwhelming majority in both branches, of a $300,000,000 agricultural conservation program for 1947. In conformity with that authorization, the Department issued a bulletin last August carrying this language:

> The provisions of the 1947 program are necessarily subject to such legislation as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided is contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

But the farmers of the country in view of the action of Congress in its emphatic authorization of the program and the long-established custom of the Congress to provide the funds to implement such authorizations, naturally considered the paragraph as a mere legal formality. No farmer seriously considered the possibility of any such contingency developing. In response to the announcement of the Department carrying this limitation, two-thirds of the farmers of the Nation have already started, and in many instances completed, conservation practices for this year and have laid plans to continue them during the coming year.

Now the committee proposes to take advantage of this fine print in their lightning-rod contract with the farmer and deprive him of the money he believes they have contracted to pay him. The farmer has made his contribution to the joint project and put up $2 to the Government's $1. He has performed in perhaps a majority of cases his part of the contract only to find that the committee here recommends that the Congress and the Government renege on its authorization enacted at the last session.

In the eyes of the farmer who has been cooperating with the Government in contracts of this character for years, and who has made such invaluable and indispensable contributions to the war program, this amounts to repudiation. And the denial of funds for the State and county committees destroys the agency which has given the farmer a voice in his own programs. It is liquidation, and with the committees thus summarily abolished arbitrary dictatorship is substituted for the democracy of the farmer-elected agency which has been their insurance against soil depletion and their guaranty of price stabilization.

I shall not burden you with my own views on the effect of the committee's recommendations on the conservation policies and practices which have been so universally approved by the Nation, but I should like to quote from an editorial on the subject carried in Sunday's New York Times, a newspaper of such eminence and fairness as to require no supplementary comments.

The following is an excerpt from the editorial page of the Times for May 25, 1947:

> The House Appropriations Committee used some noble language in reporting the Agriculture Department's 1948 budget on Friday.
>
> As we give thought to such a problem as soil conservation and to the saving of the surplus of our land from the influences of erosion we also have the responsibility of pursuing those policies that will prevent the erosion of that rugged individual character which has made the American farmer the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in any time or generation of the world's history.

It is quite true that the farmer's individualism may have been eroded by some aspects of the parity program. There is just criticism to be made of that program, as this newspaper has frequently pointed out. But it is hard to see how individualism can be restored or improved by the drastic slashes the committee has recommended in funds which are actually spent for conservation. The Soil Conservation Service recently estimated that a million acres of top soil were lost each year between 1895 and 1930; that 50 percent of our farmlands had been damaged; and that the cost had reached the appalling total of $4,000,000 a year. By way of comment the House committee cut the service's allowance from $44,860,000 to $38,673,000.

My friends, even in the city, where the paramount interest in agriculture is to secure sufficient production to meet daily needs and sufficient buying power to maintain urban industry, they realize the tragedy of cutting this vital and important appropriation at this critical time.

Then you will recall that Public Law 320, better known as section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, earmarks 30 percent of the customs revenue as a permanent appropriation to agriculture to encourage domestic consumption and export of surplus agricultural products, and to reestablish the farmer's purchasing power.

This law was put upon the statute books because of the general recognition that the tariff laws discriminated against the farmer; that they favored industry at the expense of the farm consumer; that they appreciated unduly and unfairly his cost of production and his cost of living. So, in order to offset that discrimination against the American farmer Congress enacted this law giving the farmer 30 percent of those same revenues to be use in maintaining farm prices, farm income, and the farm standard of living. It was one of the fairest provisions ever made and is in effect restitution. For the committee here to suddenly nullify the law, to in effect disregard the covenant under which it was enacted, is bad faith. You are continuing the advantages of the tariff to industry and to labor and you are discontinuing the little sop that is given to the farmer for the purpose of in some short measure compensating him for that discrimination.

The remarkable thing is that the use of these section 32 funds has been a business success and has brought profit to the Government. If you eliminate the OPA subsidies, which were not for the benefit of agriculture at all, but solely for the benefit of the consumer, and if you confine the use of the section 32 funds to loans and price operations, the Government has made a profit on every dollar expended from the section 32 funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope for the accuracy of the record the gentleman is talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation credit and funds, not section 32 funds, because all the subsidies were handled out of Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Mr. CANNON. Eliminating those expenditures which cannot be credited to the farmer because OPA subsidies were gratuities to the consumer and not to the farmer, the Government has made a profit.

The remarkable thing is that in the operation of the rehabilitation agencies and compensating agencies financed for the benefit of agriculture we discovered we were not only helping the farmer and helping the Nation but that the expenditures are good business investments.

When we authorized HOLC and bailed out the banks and the insurance companies, everybody expected a huge deficit. But HOLC has paid out dollar for dollar. We are not going to lose a penny on it. As a matter of fact, it is so successful that they are coming in here with a proposal from money changers who want to get their hands on these good loans to make us sell this HOLC paper to private interests. So, HOLC was not only a philanthropic success; it was also a business success.

Likewise, REA is a profitable investment. Some people have the idea that when you appropriate money for REA it is a gift or a grant. As a matter of fact, we are getting back every dollar we put in REA. We loan on the best security. Up to this time we not only have a negligible deficit but we have in many instances paid in advance.

As a matter of fact, practically all of these agencies we have created for the rehabilitation of agriculture have been as bread cast upon the waters and have returned to us manyfold.

I trust that any discussion of the school-lunch program is superfluous. But we have here the astonishing recommendation from the committee reducing the minimum amount required to $45,000,000.

Here is a phase that is frequently overlooked. When you appropriate $45,000,000 for children, they will not get the $45,000,000 in food. Under the statute there is a provision that out of each of these appropriations, $10,000,000 must be taken for equipment. Out of that $45,000,000, you will get only $35,000,000 for food. Of course, the key to the proposition of the committee is that they will not count the child's payments. Every child gets more than he pays for. Those who cannot pay are taken care of when otherwise they would go hungry. Why should such payments not be considered as matching funds? There is no reason in the world except a desire to liquidate this essential service to the children of the country. If we adhere to this requirement of not counting the money paid in by the children, there are only three States in the Nation qualified to meet these limitations—New York, Delaware, and Utah.

In many of the other States the legislatures do not meet until 1949, and even if they did it would be difficult to arrange plans to meet the situation.

Every authority, both educational and medical, says it is the best investment that we could make of American funds at this time.

Again, let me quote from Sunday's New York Times:

> The conservation of human beings is also important. A small item in this bill has been the school lunch program which the committee cut from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. It is all important—

They are quoting the committee's report—

> It is all important, the committee observes, to turn our venture back to the States as soon as possible.

That is the principal argument made in favor of cutting the school-lunch program.

> The reason for the Federal subsidy is, of course, that some States cannot afford the cost. This particular economy may deprive many children of a hot lunch they really need.

The committee proposes to liquidate the provision Farmers' Home Administration—that is the plan to provide in the country for the farmer what we have already accomplished in the city with the Federal Housing Administration and the HOLC. The success of the Home Administration program has been phenomenal. You recall that one reason for the adoption of this program was the appalling increase in farm tenancy. In the last report of the Department of Agriculture for May 1947 they show that in the South we had one-fifth fewer tenants in 1946 than we had in 1940 and we have the lowest farm tenancy in the history of the Nation.

According to the further report from the Department of Agriculture, the number of owner-operated farms has gone up 10 percent in 16 Southern States. Yet, this program is one of those that is hardest hit by this bill. Instead of providing $35,000 as the budget asked or $50,000, as we have today, or $25,000 as was originally provided by the committee, they in effect eliminate it.

The denial falls with greatest force upon the veterans and the small tenants. They say the veterans and tenants must be protected against themselves; that they are in danger of going out and paying too much for a farm. May I call attention to one thing that should be emphasized in connection with the Farmers' Home Administration. A farm can be provided for an applicant only upon the concurrence of all committee men; they must make their estimate not upon present farm prices or current farm income, but they are required—and the requirement is rigidly adhered to—to make their estimates only on the long-time earning capacity of the farm and on the long-time average of prices. But the committee is denying these men the right to own their own farms, to have a loan with which to develop the farm they already own.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If we should pass the Cunningham bill that provides for something similar to the Bankhead-Jones law for veterans, that would take care of that situation as far as the veteran is concerned, would it not?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, that is a contingency. The bill has not been passed and may not be passed. Here we have a law on the statute books under which we know we can provide for the ex-serviceman. Here is something we have in our hand.

A bird in the hand—is the noblest work of God.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The Cunningham bill would not do anything more than we have got. We have already got basic legislation. That would have to go back to the same Appropriations Committee to implement it with money, and if they will not implement existing legislation, why, by changing the name, would we expect them to furnish the money?

Mr. CANNON. Of course. We should take advantage of such facilities as we now have for providing homes for veterans and tenants. Why fly to ills we know not of?

[Mr. CANNON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the facilities of the House are hardly adequate to properly display these charts, but I trust you will bear with me, as I want to call them to the attention of the committee. Since I could not hang them here, I do not have them arranged in the order in which I wanted to comment on them, but we can at least begin with this one, which I consider very alarming.

This chart was just prepared this afternoon to show the trend of food production and of food consumption per capita of the United States. Food production is this broken line here. The food production per capita of the United States is up to 125 percent of what it was in 1925. The food consumption per capita is up to about 116 percent. Food production went up because our Nation asked our farmers to increase the production of food. The farmers responded. They increased the production of food. We now have an agricultural plant capable of and actually producing 125 percent of its normal production. We have not increased food consumption in the United States at the same rate. What does that mean? What does that mean to you? To me it means simply that now that we have passed the period when we closed this gap with sales to the military and to UNRRA there is a 10-percent margin between consumption and production. That means surpluses. To me that word "surplus" in agriculture means danger. It means losses to the farmer, and it means low prices. It means agricultural disaster.

If there ever was a time when we need to take care of our farm problems and when we need to beware of what is about to befall agriculture in this Nation, it

seems to me that this chart which shows the ratio of agricultural production to American consumption should make it plain that that time is coming in the next few months, or at least in the next few years. Of course, as long as we continue to export 400,000,000 bushels of grain to Europe, we may postpone the evil day. But the agricultural plant has been increased in response to the needs of our Government, and only our Government can make the provisions to close that gap which now exists between production and consumption. Unless it is closed, there can be nothing but disaster in agricultural prices.

Now, what does this bill do for agriculture prices? For one thing, it reaches in and grabs out the support under surpluses. Section 32, the crutch on which agriculture has leaned for all these years, is rudely jerked out from under us, and we are told that just at the period when agriculture is facing the greatest surplus which it has probably ever faced, we are going to be without that support.

My friends, I wonder why we have a bill of this kind? I am not here to make any partisan charges. I am not here to lay the blame on any individual, but I wonder why we have this kind of thinking that brings in a bill of this kind; why we have a philosophy of government today that leads our Government to encourage the farmer to increase production and then pulls the props out from under him? I wonder if it is not due to the fact that there has been so much propaganda over this country to the effect that the farmer is robbing the American public; to the effect that the farmer is getting prices that are all out of line with what anybody else gets.

Let me show you a few more charts. Let us look at this chart. I think this is one of the most illuminating charts. It is just two little lines. It does not look like very much, but this shows the per capita food cost and the percentage of income in the United States from 1913 to 1946. Back in 1920, the actual food expenditures of the American people were about 33 percent of their income. They run now to about 23 percent of the national income. But they would not be that high if you follow the line of the cost of a given quantity of food, representing the average annual amount consumed. If the consumption had remained the same, you would find that the food that in 1920 took some 33 percent of the American national income can now be bought for some 17 percent of the national income. The American people are actually eating more, but even so they are doing it on a smaller part of their income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. What we are actually eating in the United States today is only costing us 19 percent of our national income, or less than two-thirds as much of the national income as we formerly spent for food. How can anybody claim that the farmer is robbing the public when the farmer is letting the man in the mill and the facory buy his food for two hours' work where he formerly had to spend 3 hours' work That is what it amounts to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman by his charts is evidently trying to establish the fact that at the moment agriculture seems to be in a rather favorable position. If that is true, does he think that the payments that were made to agriculture, initiated back in the depression time, should now be continued at about those levels, or would he not believe that possibly some of that money might be saved for a rainy day?

Mr. POAGE. Of course, it is most unfortunate that the majority leader did not observe the first chart that I showed here, which I think shows as clearly as can be shown that we are faced with a gap between agricultural production and agricultural consumption that must inevitably lead to surplus, and an early break in agricultural prices, leading to agricultural disaster.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I was here and I saw the first chart you exhibited. I noticed the 10 percent that you pointed out. If we were not shipping so much food abroad, I do not know whether our consumers would go up to that 125 percent or not. There are many people who think that they probably would. I do not know what may ultimately happen to that.

Mr. POAGE. Undoubtedly, if the gentleman wants to break the price of agricultural products down to a low enough level, he can sell the consumption of the American farms at a bankrupt price. If that is what the gentleman proposes, then, of course, in spite of my statement that I did not intend to inject any personalities or any partisanship in this discussion, I must suggest that the leadership of the Republican Party has certainly deserted every claim to farm support, if that is what the gentleman proposes. Certainly the farmers of America are entitled to a living wage. That living wage has been fixed by this Government as parity. We are guaranteeing to the farmers only 90 percent of a living wage. How many of your laborers, how many of your capitalists will accept 90 percent of a fair return and think that they are being fairly treated? How can it be said that the farmer who is assured only 90 percent of parity is robbing anybody else? We are now told that the farmer who is getting 90 percent of a living wage as defined by law is destroying the economy of everybody else. Let us see just how the farmer compares with other groups.

It is true that realized net income of farm operators has increased substantially as a result of increases in both agricultural prices and in production. In spite of this fact, the preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show an average realized net income per farm operator in 1946 of $2,565 per year, or about $49 per week per family. This is the farm family's total return from farming, and includes the value of the home-produced food, as well as the rental value of the farm home. It includes the total return on the family's investment, the farmer's management, and his own labor and whatever labor other members of the family contribute to farm production. The average family had an equity of about $11,700 in farm real estate, machinery, motor vehicles, livestock, and crops on hand as of January 1, 1946. Interest on this equity at 5 percent would amount to $585 per year. Deducting this interest on the investment from the realized net income would leave but $1,980, or about $38 per week, as the income of the farmer and his family for labor and management. This compares with an average weekly wage of $47.47 per wage earner, for factory workers. When it is remembered that in a very large percentage of the cases there are at least two wage earners in the farm family, it will immediately become apparent how poorly farm income compares with the income of industrial workers, even at present prices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, I believe, is overexercised about section 32 funds. After all, Congress in the deficiency bill just last week restored entirely the lending power of $4,750,000,000 of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that is one way we are taking care of the 90-percent-parity funds.

Mr. POAGE. Possibly the gentleman is overexercised, but I am one of those who saw the disaster which surplus farm production brought to this land. I have seen the terrible effect of these surpluses and I, for one, have not forgotten the lesson. I, for one, do not propose to take steps that are going to lead us into another catastrophe of that kind; and I do not believe the gentleman from Minnesota wants to. I am convinced by all the figures and by all the facts, that we are on the road to that kind of catastrophe; if we do not provide machinery now, to cope with the problem, but the gentleman offers no solution; the majority leader offers no solution except to take it out of the farmers' hide, reduce farm prices to such extent that you can sell your products for practically nothing. Get prices down, says the majority leader, and then maybe our farm products will be consumed. Sure, if you sell your cotton at 4 cents a pound it will be consumed. Certainly, if you break the price of corn down to two-bits a bushel it will all be consumed. Certainly if you break the price of cattle down to a nickel, then you can sell them. Then the Republican Party can say, "We have got full consumption." But if you are going to give to the farmer a fair price, even 90 percent of a living wage, then you have got to do something now about that gap that exists or we all know what will happen.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again emphasize the fact that farmers, as a class, are still giving more to society and getting less in return than any other group.

I want to again emphasize the fact that support prices are not high prices. The prices that we have tried to maintain for farmers are far lower than the prices received by other groups. They

are lower than the recognized living-wage standard; they are only 90 percent of parity. When we compare the gains made by farmers on one hand, and by industrial workers and capital on the other hand, we find that the farmer runs a poor third comparing wages, prices, and profits, during the period 1935–39 with the same items. In 1947, we find that:

Prices received by farmers in April 1947 were up 253 percent.

Prices paid by farmers in April 1947 were up 180 percent.

Farmers were, therefore, relative better off by 73 percent.

Wages received by industrial workers in March 1947 were up 213 percent.

Since that time many wages have been increased 15 percent.

Prices paid by industrial workers in March 1947, 228 percent.

Workers were, therefore, relatively better off by 72 percent.

Profits made by corporations in 1946 were up 336 percent.

Prices paid for food by urban people in 1946 were up 190 percent.

Capitalists are, therefore, relatively better off by 146 percent.

When we take the comparison back to the base period of 1909–14 it is even more striking. I do not have the figures on corporate profits during this period, but I do have the figures on prices received by farmers as compared with prices farmers paid and the hourly earnings received by industrial workers as compared with the prices they paid. These figures show:

Prices received by farmers in 1947 were up 280 percent.

Prices paid by farmers in March 1947 were up 227 percent.

Farmers are, therefore, relatively better off by 53 percent.

Compared with this we find, using the same base period:

Hourly earnings received by industrial workers in March 1947 were up 557 percent.

Prices paid by industrial workers in March 1947 were up 227 percent.

Workers were, therefore, relatively better off by 330 percent.

Can it be charged that under these circumstances farm prices are unfair or too high? Can it be that the majority leader, or the subcommittee that wrote this bill, would seriously contend that we should remove the most effective supports to farm prices simply in order to give more fortunate and more prosperous segments of our society a further advantage?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will get me more time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better proceed to read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Will the chairman permit me to yield for one extension?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, almost everybody knows it has taken nearly a decade of diligent effort to bring the farmers of this Nation to the present state of prosperity they now enjoy. Furthermore, many people know how serious and far-reaching the results have been when depressions have overtaken agriculture. In my opinion it is unwise to take any chance with the welfare of American agriculture which is so vital to so many people of this Nation and the world as a whole.

It is my sincere hope that the present agricultural appropriations bill will be appropriately amended to the end that our farm program, which admittedly has been a constructive one, will not receive a set-back which could be the forerunner of chaos in many of the aspects of agriculture.

Agriculture in its many phases has been benefited greatly by the rural electrification program. Highly pleased are the farmers who have received the advantages and benefits of this program. There are many other farmers in our area and throughout the Nation who desire the benefits of REA. It is my hope that this segment of our agricultural program will not be injured or unnecessarily delayed by the action of this Congress. Necessary funds to properly expand the REA program so that it will reach as many farmers as possible, of course on a sound basis, should be carried in this appropriation bill.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion with respect to the rule under which this appropriation bill comes to the floor for consideration. I think it should be made clear, in deference to the committee in charge of this measure, that the rule does not put this House in a so-called strait-jacket. I have on many occasions opposed such rules that have been brought to this floor in the past. Such rules did not permit offering amendments of any kind. This bill is subject, as in the case of other bills, to amendment and debate. Any Member will have a chance, if he chooses to do so, to offer amendments from the floor to strike portions therefrom. Or he may offer amendments to add to this legislation if he feels he can get support for such amendments. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, only to further clarify a situation that seems to have become somewhat beclouded.

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the necessity of balancing the Nation's budget, and the elimination of unnecessary functions, duplication of service, and excessive personnel in all the administrative phases of our National Government. I am concerned, and gravely so, when I read the Agriculture appropriations bill, making extreme reductions in farm appropriations. We should move with great caution when we attempt to cut expenses which directly affect the farmers of the country.

The farmers of the Nation will express indignation over the tremendous slash in the $300,000,000 for the AAA conservation program specifically approved by Congress last year. It can be argued with good conscience that this is breaking the faith with millions of farmers. There is grave concern as to whether or not the reduction of administrative expenses to $15,000,000 will permit the State and county PMA offices to carry out their program successfully, and as well to handle commodity loans and other price-support functions vital to millions of farmers.

On the question of rural electrification I yield to the committee the right, without question, to cut administrative costs $1,600,000. I cannot with complete understanding see why the loan program, which is a self-liquidating program, should have been cut $25,000,000. This item should be reinstated on the floor without question.

Although there is a great demand for farm products today, and the problem of surpluses, generally speaking, is negligible, still in a nation with as gigantic a productive capacity as we have in the United States we can anticipate surpluses in the future. Now is the time for investigation and research in this field. Because of this, principally, I am alarmed over the complete elimination of section 32 funds for surplus disposal and the small appropriation allowed to carry out the program of the Hope-Flannagan Act, which was passed almost unanimously by Congress last year.

In our aspirations to find the real road to economy, we must not be led astray, especially when we deprive the farmers themselves of the benefits to which they are rightfully entitled.

I do not wish to convey the impression that I am just knocking everything accomplished by the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I feel that they very judiciously handled a great many phases of what was necessarily a complicated and detailed appropriation bill. I feel that the subcommittee is to be complimented for their treatment of many of these phases, and I think especially of the Extension Service, which has proved so important to the development of agriculture throughout the several States. Although a cut was made in the Soil Conservation Service, I am pleased that the cut was not so severe as

to seriously cripple this organization, which offers technical advice to farmers of the Nation.

I regret that I am forced to disagree with the subcommittee, but feel I must, in the interest of the Nation's farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who have spoken on this side today may be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. NIXON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the quarterly magazine Law and Contemporary Problems.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper editorial and in the other a magazine article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at page 5891 of the RECORD of May 23, in the first column on that page, in a colloquy between the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself I am quoted as saying:

If the comparable prices which can be justified and which the President of the United States says are proper in lieu of parity prices were in effect, the prices would be about 3 cents above 1946 in 90 percent of the cases.

That is not a correct transcription of what I said. What I actually said was:

If the comparable prices which can be justified and which the President of the United States says are proper in lieu of parity prices were in effect, the prices would be above 3 cents above the 1946 prices even though only 90 percent of comparable prices were paid.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD may be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with the House meeting at 10 o'clock tomorrow, will we proceed immediately to the consideration of the pending appropriation bill?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Or will there be preliminary business?

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is we will proceed immediately to the consideration of the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LIMITING APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW TO COUNSEL EMPLOYED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 46

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 107, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to limit, curtail, or augment any existing authority in such committee or its counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim, action, proceeding, or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

Mr. ALBERT requested, pursuant to rule XXXVIII, leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of H. R. 6146, a private relief bill for Mrs. Thelma Crosslin, Seventy-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'HARA, from May 28 to May 31, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, May 26, 27, 28, and 29, on account of attending Congressman Bradley's funeral.

To Messrs. KUNKEL, GILLIE, SHAFER, GRANT of Indiana, JONKMAN, and DINGELL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), to attend funeral of Congressman Bradley.

To Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. RILEY (at the request of Mr. RICHARDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. NIXON (at the request of Mr. POULSON), for 4 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3029. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 26, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2094. An act for the relief of Isaac B. Jones.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 28, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

713. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to H. R. 3492, section 5, transfer of war housing to the War or Navy Department; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

714. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to H. R. 3492, section 5, transfer of war housing to the War or Navy Department; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

edge of the committee's problems appeared limitless. His entire life was devoted to the United States merchant marine, and his great desire was to see our merchant marine second to none. In spite of the long hours spent in the committee work, he was always willing to speak on merchant-marine subjects at any function. He supported his views courageously and with true sincerity, and all shipping men with whom he came in contact held him in the highest esteem.

His entire committee was devoted to him and was impressed with his fairness. He was more than a chairman of a committee; he was really a friend of each member. He was ready to listen to suggestions and often encouraged the members to follow through with their suggestions.

Words are inadequate to express my feelings on the passing of this real friend, and I shall ever cherish the memory of my happy associations with him.

## The Disposition of Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, by strange coincidence just at the time the Congress began the consideration of Agriculture appropriations bill there appeared a series of articles and pictures all over the country condemning the potato-disposal program. This publicity was so presented as to give the very definite impression that farmers were charging consumers unfair prices and that the Department of Agriculture was conniving with farmers to keep needed food away from hungry people. These implications simply are not true. The facts are that the American people at the beginning of 1947 spend only 19 percent of their income for food, whereas 20 years ago they spent 50 percent more of their income for the same food. The facts are that these potatoes are available to any charity or relief organization—absolutely free.

The facts are that American farmers are supplying more food for American urban dwellers, in return for less hours of work on the part of the urban citizens than was ever done in any country in all the history of the world.

Had it not been for the circumstance of timing and the continued repetition of these articles, I would have dismissed them as a part of the continuing program of abuse of farmers, but coming at the time they do I cannot but feel that they are intended to influence the action of the House on the pending appropriation bill. I have, therefore, sought to secure the facts about the potato program. I submit them for the record that all may know. I do not contend that the program is ideal. On the contrary, I hope they will be able to develop a better program but, until we do, I think it is but fair that we know all the facts before we criticize the present program.

I have today been advised by the Department of Agriculture that any citizen of the United States can buy potatoes similar to the ones that were destroyed in Alabama for the total price of $5 per carload f. o. b. if he will but give adequate assurance that the potatoes will be used for production of starch or alcohol.

If he will agree to export the potatoes he can have them at 4 cents per hundredweight. If he wants to use them for relief or for charitable purposes there will be absolutely no charge. The trouble is that the potatoes are actually not worth shipping either to the starving people of Europe or to the processing plants of the United States. The Department of Agriculture has tried to sell or give away these potatoes without success. To keep them longer but adds to the storage costs. To try to ship them to Europe now that the warm weather has set in will require refrigeration, and the cost per unit of food will be greater with free potatoes than it will with wheat at $3 per bushel.

I here and now offer these potatoes at the afore-mentioned price to all who are disposed to charge that they are being wasted.

Under what is known as the Steagall amendment, farmers are promised price support on many important agricultural commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for two full calendar years after the formal declaration of the end of hostilities. Potatoes are one of the Steagall commodities.

Following 1945, when there was considerable difficulty in disposing of the third largest potato crop on record, the Department in 1946 ran into full-scale problems in handling an even larger crop, despite efforts to keep the crop within the bounds of effective demand. Disposal efforts—after all measures had been taken to handle the crop in regular distribution channels—included distribution through the school-lunch program, special export programs, diversion to livestock feed and industrial use. Even though every conceivable step was taken by the Department to find use for the surplus potatoes, the result of overproduction was waste of a portion of the crop and consequent cost to the Government. Following is a summary of the various steps taken to handle the 1946 crop.

Despite lowered production goals for 1946, a combination of many factors—the use of better seed, the employment of new and improved insecticides, and ideal growing conditions throughout the Nation—produced a record potato crop of nearly 475,000,000 bushels. This was estimated to be from nearly ninety to one hundred million bushels in excess of the 378,000,000-bushel production goal and 50,000,000 bushels above the large 1945 output of 425,000,000 bushels.

The Department of Agriculture recognized early in the year that a bumper crop would be harvested and made immediate preparations to assist all branches of the distributive food trades in moving these potatoes through normal channels of distribution into human consumption. From the outset of the problem in 1946, the Department cooperated fully with the food industry in moving potatoes. This industry-Government cooperation is estimated to have resulted in a substantial increase in consumption of potatoes during at least part of the year.

But as the potato harvest progressed northward from the early producing Southern States, it became impossible for normal food-distribution channels to handle the enormous potato supplies. The Department followed an aggressive and continuing program of moving potatoes into its school-lunch program and to charitable institutions. To these outlets potatoes were furnished free, as in past years. During the last year, nearly 3,000,000 bushels of potatoes were so utilized.

Every effort was made to get these potatoes to hungry people abroad. They were offered at nearly token prices—as low as 4 cents per 100 pounds—for relief feeding abroad. In addition, a subsidy program was set up under which private exporters were able to send potatoes to South America and the Philippines, as well as other countries. By May of 1947 about 10,500,000 bushels—which was more than 10 percent of the total surplus—had been exported to points as widely separated as Italy and Korea, Germany, and China.

When outlets to human consumption became clogged, the Department pressed a program of diverting surplus potatoes to livestock feed, so that the potatoes would eventually take their place in the form of meat and milk in the human diet. Potatoes for use as livestock feed, for feeding dairy cattle, and for fattening beef cattle and hogs were made available at prices that ranged from 20 cents per hundredweight f. o. b. at country shipping points to a penny a hundredweight. Through this program the Department moved approximately 11,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

The Department, in its efforts to find a practical utilization for the potatoes, also made another estimated 10,500,000 bushels available to starch mills manufacturing starch for use both in the United States and abroad.

The greatest diversion of potatoes that otherwise would have been completely wasted was to the distillers of beverage and industrial alcohol. Into these outlets the Department moved around 30,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

Thus, by exploiting diversion outlets to the fullest possible extent, the Department was able to find effective use for nearly 65,000,000 bushels of the approximately ninety-to-one-hundred-million-bushel surplus.

The Department believes, according to preliminary figures, that in the course of handling this all-time record crop of potatoes there was a resulting waste of something like 22,000,000 bushels. Roughly, this is about what Department officials had estimated earlier as a probable figure on waste and shrinkage. In view of the size of the crop, it was believed that no practical use could be found for some 20 percent of the surplus potatoes. Every effort was made, however, to keep this waste and shrinkage to

a minimum and to confine it to low-grade and inferior-quality potatoes, which customarily would encounter difficulties in finding a market.

The over-all cost to the Government under the mandatory support program has been estimated at $100,000,000. Of this amount the Department will recover about $20,000,000, leaving a net cost to the Government of approximately $80,000,000.

Recognizing that a combination of better cultural practices and a pronounced shift of potato acreage from low- to high-producing areas promised continued high yields per acre, the Department tightened its potato program for 1947.

The program called for a reduction in national acreage from 2,669,800 to 2,517,000 acres and set up acreage quotas within which potato growers must remain in order to be eligible for price support. This was done after a study of data that revealed yields per acre has been increasing at a more rapid rate than had been earlier estimated—at a time when potato acreage has been declining nationally. The 1947 goal in production is 375,000,000 bushels.

Another significant factor is that per capita consumption of potatoes has been declining as national food habits turned from heavy breakfasts and the potato at other meals competed with other vegetables readily made available both through better transportation facilities and the avenue of processed foods.

The 1947 potato price-support program emphasizes further that removal of potatoes from food channels will be limited insofar as possible to the lower-grade and inferior quality potatoes which growers have historically found difficulty in marketing. This will be accomplished by government purchase of lower grades, and through marketing agreements and orders, and will result in the consumer obtaining better quality potatoes.

As distribution in commercial channels fails to handle all marketable potatoes, the Department will continue, under the 1947 program, to make available for school lunch, for charitable institutions and organizations, all the potatoes these outlets can handle. These potatoes will be furnished free.

Export operations will also continue to the extent that supplies warrant such operations, as will diversion to stock feed and manufacturing plants.

Farmers generally seem to be staying within their 1947 acreage goals, according to reports up to this time. It is anticipated that there may be, however, some local surpluses in the early and intermediate potato-producing areas, due to adverse spring weather. Because of delaying weather, potato harvests in these areas may tend to "bunch up" and overlap this year, instead of coming on in an orderly area-by-area manner.

One such circumstance has been encountered this month in Alabama. There a supply of about 28,500 bushels of early potatoes beyond usual needs developed. Of this amount, 21,000 bushels were distributed to school lunch and institutions. For the others, No. 2 and B grade potatoes, every avenue of possible practical use was explored. It was determined that there were no dehydration facilities available and that farmers with good pasture did not wish to experiment with feeding these potatoes to their livestock. The potatoes are thin-skinned and of such high water content that export was not feasible. Freight charges precluded sending these potatoes north for use in starch plants. Alcohol plants were not interested in so small an amount of potatoes—their use of potatoes is predicated upon a continuing supply.

All avenues of practical disposition having been explored and no practical use being found for the 7,500 bushels of potatoes remaining, there was no recourse but to dump them. This ultimate, and seemingly wasteful, disposition of the smaller portion of the local surplus of Alabama potatoes is a practice historically followed by all potato producers. When the producer finds his market glutted, he ordinarily brings to market his best potatoes and abandons the lower grades, frequently leaving them in the ground to save the labor cost.

In other areas, as in Alabama, every effort will be made to get 1947 crop potatoes into human consumption. Following that, every avenue through which the potatoes may be put to some practical use, for stock feed or manufactured products, will be explored before a single bushel of potatoes is dumped. The only potatoes that will be so disposed of, if that is the only recourse, will be potatoes of low grade and inferior quality which would not ordinarily appear in food channels.

Of course, all of us wish that it were possible to hold the farmers' price up to a fair level and at the same time to let the consumer buy his potatoes at less than cost, but so far no one has been able to suggest any way of doing this except for the Government to take all the loss—in other words, for the Government to subsidize the consumers. Actually the consumer is today getting his potatoes for less than parity—the support price is only 90 percent of what has been recognized as a fair price. Surely, it will not be contended that the Government should subsidize the price to a lower level, or that the consumer is entitled to get his food at less than 90 percent of a fair price. But that is what would result if the price of potatoes were allowed to fall, and, of course, everyone knows that without a further subsidy which this Congress is not going to pay, that is what would happen if these surplus potatoes were put into the channels of trade.

All farmers ask is a living wage. This program gives him 90 percent of a living wage. Even the most violent anti-labor partisans admit that a man has a right to quit work when he does not get a living wage. The farmer has already performed his labor. Now, if his product is not sold it has the same effect on our economy as does the refusal of the miners' union to dig coal, or the refusal of the automobile workers to make automobiles. None of us like strikes, but who would criticize if workers struck for the minimum wage fixed by law. These potato farmers are now only getting 90 percent of the living price of farmers' minimum wage fixed by the same Government.

By all means, let us try to work out a better plan for handling farm surpluses, but until we do let us at least carry out the promises Congress made when we passed the Steagall amendment. Let us make good our word, the word of our Government. Let us stop this weasel talk every time it comes to carrying out our promises to support farm prices. If you do not like the way the Department is supporting prices, change the law—you wrote the law under which the Department acts and you prescribed the method of supporting prices. I do not care how you do it—but I do want it done. I do not have a bushel of potatoes grown for marketing in my district, but the whole question of the good faith of our Government is at stake; and as for those who say that the Department should use these potatoes for various purposes, the opportunity is yours. If you really believe that somebody can use them, why do you not try? I repeat the offer—$5 per carload for industrial purposes.

I would like to respectfully suggest, as we would say in Texas, "Put up or shut up."

## Feed Shortage in Dairy Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, May 26, 1947*

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving telegrams from dairymen in the district which I have the honor to represent, calling attention to the low price they are receiving for milk and the high price of feed for the dairy cattle.

It is obvious that the vast volume of grain which has already been shipped to foreign countries and the volume to be allocated for export is causing food for both cattle and humans to be reduced to the danger point. The high price paid by the Government for wheat became so scandalously high that the Government shifted to the purchase of flour to divert the attention of the public from the price paid for wheat.

There are more cattle on the hoof in France now than before the war. It is not to the hungry or starving to which much of our grain goes, but rather to feed foreign livestock and to supply the black markets abroad. Much of the food shipped supposedly to feed the civilian population overseas goes to fatten large foreign standing armies.

The time is long overdue for those who represent the United States to give thought to the welfare of our own people. It is high time to take an inventory of our own stock of foods, actual and potential, before making wild and reckless commitments to foreign countries. It was only a short time ago that the ad-

and, he must have the confidence of the public. A brilliant record that is spotted with charges, suspicions, and controversies will not inspire such confidence, especially when those charges relate to the attitude of an officer toward the public. We hope that the Commissioners will feel their responsibility in this matter as keenly as if they had been elected by the people whom they serve.

## Labor-Industry School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following newspaper story describing the labor-industry school of the Botany Worsted Mills, in Passaic, N. J., which today graduates its first class of 400 students. The account appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 25, 1947:

LABOR-INDUSTRY SCHOOL IN JERSEY ENDS FIRST TERM—BOTANY PROJECT, STARTED IN SEPTEMBER, HELPS MILL'S ACTIVITY, BOTH SIDES AGREE

A school in labor-management relations in which union-shop stewards and supervisors study side by side with company foremen and with management officials will hold its first graduation exercises Tuesday at Botany Worsted Mills, Passaic, N. J.

Believed by its founder to be the first comprehensive plan of its kind in the country, the school is conducted jointly by the Textile Workers' Union of America, a Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate, and Botany Mills, one of the country's largest textile manufacturers. Classes were begun last September to promote better mutual understanding between the labor and management officials who handle the company's labor problems.

In a course operated according to standard academic procedures, student foremen and stewards study the letter of their contract and of labor laws, the precedents of grievance procedures and the broader aims on which company and union agree. According to George Baldanzi, vice president of the national union, it offers to "labor a real opportunity to sit down and talk things over with management."

In the same vein, the president of the company, Charles F. H. Johnson, says he considers that one of the school's greatest assets is that it provides a chance "for all concerned to get to know one another and to know each other's problems."

The school was started within a year of the company's signing of its first union contract, in 1945, which provides for a union shop. The company had had several brushes with the National Labor Relations Board, but since the union has been recognized Mr. Johnson says he has come to believe that cooperation is the best way of achieving the "joint goal of continuous and efficient production."

In September 1946, Mr. Johnson; Mr. Baldanzi; C. F. H. Johnson, Jr., general manager; Maj. Gen. Irving M. Phillipson, United States Army (retired), director of industrial relations; and others discussed the need for the school. It was agreed that there was a lack of special training for those directly concerned with labor disputes—foremen are likely to be promoted for their industrial skill and union leaders elected for their activities outside of the shop, while neither is necessarily a specialist in human relationships.

To meet the situation the school was organized to help resolve complaints and grievances as closely as possible to the point of origin—directly between foremen and shop stewards when possible. Both sides are taught that the great majority of individual complaints arise from such human variables as health, temperament and social problems outside of the concern. The students are continually reminded that "workers don't leave their personalities behind when they punch the time clock."

The course consists of 20 1-hour classes, held on company time three times a day to accommodate different shifts. Less than 20 students make up an average class. The teachers are from the ranks of both labor and management and the curriculum is agreed upon by both parties.

Since there was no precedent for setting up the school, the procedure has had to develop as it goes along. There is as yet no textbook for the course, but the lectures and exercises given this winter have been consolidated and will soon be published, Mr. Johnson said.

About 400 students will be graduated from the first session on Tuesday, said Mr. Johnson, and a number of industrialists from several parts of the country, interested in adopting the plan, will attend the ceremony at 6:30 p. m. at the plant. Because of the large turn-over of labor in the mill—which, with 5,600 workers, is the largest single employer in Passaic—the course will be continuous and will train new foremen and stewards as they are appointed or elected.

So far Mr. Johnson and Mr. Baldanzi are enthusiastic about their plan. Since the school began the record shows a decrease in top-level disputes, a lower incidence of absenteeism, and increased production.

## Agriculture Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1947.*

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Farmers deeply shocked at several recommendations of House Appropriations Committee on Agriculture Appropriations. Our organization offered sincere aggressive support for real constructive economy by eliminating unnecessary personnel, excessive expenditures and duplication of services. But we asked committee not to cut heart out of farm program. Instead committee made most of savings at expense of farmers and vital farm program and failed to require reduction in many badly overstaffed agencies. Farmers are especially indignant over cut in 1947; $300,000,000 AAA conservation program specifically approved by Congress last year to $165,000,000, thereby breaking faith with millions of farmers and also complete elimination of program in 1948. Reduction of administrative expenses to $15,000,000 will make it impossible for State and county PMA officers to carry out this program successfully and to handle commodity loans and other price support functions vital to millions of farmers. Farmers in every section are alarmed over complete elimination of section 32 funds for surplus disposal which Congress has approved as permanent appropriations. Farmers also greatly concerned over failure to provide even first year's allotment of research funds approved under Hope-Flannagan Act which passed almost unanimously last year. We favor strict economy but strongly protest foregonig actons as false economy and breaking faith with farmers. These vital programs were adopted by bipartisan votes in Congress. Millions of farmers are looking to you to rectify these injustices and keep faith with farmers above party by providing these vitally needed funds.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*

## Labor Law Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the Duke University Law School, of which I am an alumnus, publishes a quarterly known as Law and Contemporary Problems. Each issue of this publication is devoted to a symposium presenting legal and other social-science aspects of a vital current problem. This journal, founded in 1933 by Prof. David F. Cavers, now of the Harvard Law School, has attained a position of distinction among legal periodicals—a unique distinction, since it is the only one which systematically correlates the legal approaches to the solution of problems with the enlightenment which can be gained by reference to the contributions of the other social sciences.

The spring 1947 issue of Law and Contemporary Problems is devoted to a symposium on labor-dispute settlement, edited by Prof. Brainerd Currie, editor of the journal, and Mr. Paul H. Sanders, formerly of the Duke Law School faculty and now of the Atlanta bar. The symposium consists of 11 articles by people of varying backgrounds and shades of opinions, discussing the problem of labor-dispute settlement from the legal standpoint, from the standpoint of the economist, from the standpoint of the psychological and sociological problems of personnel administration, and from the standpoint of the public interest. Some of the articles were prepared by labor leaders, some by representatives of management, and others by observers of industrial relations who have no affiliation with either side. The symposium as a whole is a balanced, well-rounded and sincere attempt to explore the problems of labor-dispute settlement in a scholarly manner.

The settlement of labor disputes is justly termed America's most serious postwar domestic problem. Because of the timeliness of this symposium, which presents a significant cross section of opinion at a time when the Congress has under consideration a major legislative program for labor, it seems to me that a copy should be placed on the desk of

every Member of Congress. I have arranged with the publishers for a complimentary copy to be sent to each Member of the House and Senate. The Duke University Law School and the editors of Law and Contemporary Problems are glad to make this distribution as a public service; they are concerned only that there be no misinterpretation of their motives in doing so. Law and Contemporary Problems is a nonprofit professional publication. It is not a crusading journal, and has no propaganda objectives. The views expressed in the articles published in the periodical are to be attributed to their authors alone and not to the periodical, its editors, or Duke University. In making copies of this symposium available to Members of Congress the publishers have no intention of attempting to influence congressional action on labor legislation. Indeed, the opinions expressed by the various authors are so diverse and frequently conflicting that it would be impossible to reconcile them for the purpose of any partisan thesis.

The Congress has not permitted itself to be stampeded by industrial conflicts into the hasty enactment of unwise labor legislation. In spite of the pressure of developments, it has taken the time to consider the issues fully and dispassionately, and to consider the long-range implications of proposed remedies for the American way of life. It is in this same spirit, hoping to perform a public service, that the publishers of Law and Contemporary Problems have made available to the Members of Congress this important collection of studies of a problem with which we must be so deeply concerned.

---

## British Plan New Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of May 25, 1947, by Constantine Brown, entitled "British Plan New Empire." I sincerely hope that our Department of State is not oblivious to this situation.

The editorial follows:

BRITISH PLAN NEW EMPIRE—SOUTH AFRICA VITAL IN COME-BACK STRUGGLE

(By Constantine Brown)

Officially inspired reports from London that Great Britain will cease to be the policeman of the Mediterranean and that the United States is expected to assume that role come as no surprise to Washington official quarters.

Britain is now attempting to organize a new empire in Africa. It has been known since last October that the London government was preparing to abandon its military obligations in the Mediterranean and was hoping that America would assume them.

Ever since the British Government decided to abandon its empire in the Far East by giving India unconditional freedom, it has been obvious that she would no longer be interested in the eastern Mediterranean, which in the past she considered her lifeline. Last October the State Department received definite information that British troops would be withdrawn from Greece. Later Britain displayed slackening interest in the question of the Dardanelles.

UNITED STATES LACKS BASES

Whether the United States will be able to replace Britain as the Mediterranean policeman is a moot question. One of the most serious physical handicaps is the fact that we have neither naval nor air bases in that area, and it seems doubtful that we could avail ourselves of the important bases at Malta or Cyprus.

Britain cannot survive even as a second-rate power without a colonial empire. It is a poor country, lacking almost all kinds of raw materials, except coal. Her population is overwhelmingly industrial. The recent food shortages, 2 years after the end of the war in Europe, reveal that she still relies almost exclusively on imported food. Adequate food supplies cannot be brought to the United Kingdom without a favorable export balance.

The British workman suffers more than the capitalist from abandonment of the Asiatic empire. This is fully realized by the Labor government and by a majority of the House of Commons. The British need an empire, not for the sake of the capitalists, who can always find an outlet for their money elsewhere, but for the sake of millions of workers.

SOME SEE DEAL WITH FRANCE

The government believes it has found the answer. It is planning to move the imperial activities to an area which can be more easily policed and which does not lend itself to international conflict—Africa, south of the Equator, with Kenya Province in the north as its chief base.

Some more ambitious Britishers, such as representatives of the Conservative Party, believe that some agreement might possibly be reached with France for joint exploitation of the entire African continent, which contains many little-developed raw materials. Except for North Africa, where the Arabs comprise a pretty solid block, the rich areas in Central Africa are populated by people who still lack any feeling of national unity. It is in such areas where imperialism can be developed and proven beneficial for those who dominate and are dominated.

Negotiations toward the creation of such an empire are being carried out at present by the governments of Britain and South Africa on the one hand and Belgium and France, which control the Congo and a portion of West Africa, on the other.

EMPIRE IS SHRINKING

The British decision to move out of Asia was taken after deliberate discussion and planning. The chief reason was that all the British politicians have become fully aware of the fact that Britain is no longer a world power. Her only hope of taking a more limited position as one of the world leaders rests in the possibility of organizing a new empire in Africa south of the Equator. This will require her to enter a partnership not only with France, Belgium, and Portugal, but also the Union of South Africa, which only last month received the royal family.

The British government abandoned India and is ready to abandon all other possessions in the Indian Ocean, including Malaya. It has no longer the means to control them, particularly since Russia has emerged as a world power of the first order and has shown clearly that it does not intend to tolerate Britain in her backyard.

According to reports from reliable sources, the whole matter of Britain moving out of Asia politically and militarily was submitted last December to Prime Minister Stalin by Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery chief of the British imperial staff. Lord Montgomery paid a visit to Moscow, where he was received with more pomp than any other western Allied military leader has been accorded.

MONTGOMERY OUTLINED POLICY

The abstemious Scot was dined and wined in true Russian fashion. He visited Russian military establishments and was presented with a sable-lined coat. But above everything else, he had a long conversation with Prime Minister Stalin, during which he is said to have expounded Britain's new policy of avoiding a clash with the U. S. S. R.

This policy is said by those who later reported on it, to have included among other things the British plan to move politically out of Asia in order to avoid the age-old contest with Russia in that area. In exchange for that liquidation of Britain's entanglements in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean, the chief of the British imperial staff wanted to know whether he could report to his superiors that the Soviet Government would be willing to respect British oil interests in the Middle East.

Lord Montgomery is said to have informed Stalin that Britain was sincere in her offer to abandon her political interests in the areas so dear to the Russian heart and that she contemplated establishing a new empire in Africa, south of Egypt. This, he said, could by no stretch of the imagination be construed as conflicting with Russia's policies. Prime Minister Stalin is said to have agreed.

NEW ALLIANCE REPORTED

The indorsement of the British plan was reported by Lord Montgomery on his return to London early last January. He called on King George VI immediately after his arrival. He also had a 2-hour session with the cabinet.

The immediate sequel of that conversation was the disclosure of a tripartite alliance between Britain, France, and Russia. For the present this alliance is not in effect. Such historic developments are subject to much bargaining and haggling. But the handful of American official observers who have followed the new trend believe they have now received at least partial confirmation of the reports of Britain's new orientation.

London has now admitted that it has sold Russia a number of jet planes. The price will be paid in Russian raw materials. But Washington has received definite information that besides these jet planes the British since January have been selling the Russians plexiglass, plastics essential in the mass production of jet planes, and a number of other inventions developed in the United Kingdom during the war.

Whatever atomic energy formula Russia possesses today came from the persons who betrayed secrets to the Soviets, as was made clear in the Canadian spy case. But the British Government's willingness to provide the Soviet Government with materials needed for modern warfare is regarded as an indication of trends in the United Kingdom.

---

## Let's Not Civilize These Happy People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I read the honest, straightforward report of Rear Adm. Carleton H. Wright, United States Navy, concerning our new island possessions in the old

measure of a person's need or financial condition other than official records, for I want these payments made not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right.

Parenthetically, while the Landis bill provides as a point of eligibility that one must not have paid an income tax the preceding year, I don't know but that it would be just as well to make the pension payment to the eligible individual, even if his income was great enough to be taxed. To my mind, such payments might just as well be made on application and determining of eligibility whether the individual be a millionaire or a day laborer.

The Landis bill provides that to be eligible at 60 for this pension a man or woman must be an American citizen and must have resided continuously in the United States for 10 years preceding the application. For my own part I would be willing to double that residence requirement. There may be, too, other requirements which should be written in. While it probably is too much to require applicants to prove a pension "earned," we do not propose this benefit as a "hand-out" to throngs of foreigners who might flock to this country to enjoy old-age benefits. The whole philosophy of this proposal is based on the assumption that a man or woman having reached the age of 60 and spent a substantial period of years of mature life as a good citizen productively in this country has helped to build the national wealth, and is therefore entitled to what might be called a special dividend in declining years.

Naturally I wish that we might have a more searching and accurate measure of an individual's contribution to the Nation's present wealth and prosperity more than a mere 10 or 20 years of residence in this country. However, I fear an attempt to set up an elaborate program and complex schedule of eligibility would make the whole plan unworkable and would open the way for what could amount to misjudgments and injustices.

Why did the authors write $60 per month as the amount? Well, that's something to aim at, and since my own State by joint plan with the Federal Government under Social Security now has a maximum of $50 per month, in counsel with Mr. Landis and others I agreed to make it tentatively somewhat larger than presently prevails in some of the more liberal States. What circumstances ought to be considered in determining what the amount shall be in such a bill? Several things must be carefully considered. What amount can the economy of the Nation provide for such payment? This is a deep and involved economic problem calling for profound study by broad-minded statesmen.

Another question. How would $60 a month to oldsters compare relatively with pensions and other benefit payments to other classes of citizens? For instance, we now have many millions of former members of the armed services and their dependents who are either receiving pensions or some form of Federal payments because of their past services. Of course, this cannot be measured accurately by what the country owes them. The soldier fought to preserve our country and he is properly rewarded for having done so. The elderly citizen should be pensioned because he or she helped to create our country, and a delicate question is raised as to relative contributions. I wish we knew which is the greater service, to help create America or to help preserve America? Of course, that cannot be adequately answered by finite minds, but benefit payments of one class must not be out of line or manifestly unjust in comparison with benefit payments to the other class. Neither can be paid what their services were worth.

Again, what limit in morality or justice, as well as economic feasibility, should enter into consideration of the amount of old-age benefits? If citizens retire at 60 and—I would not have compulsory retirement written into the law—if they retire from active work, the burden of economic support falls upon the remaining population. No one could ever justify throwing a large group of elderly citizens, living in comparative ease and luxury, as a burden upon the backs of the younger generation to the extent of lowering the latter's standard of living. This system of old-age-benefit payments must not be a crushing burden upon the oncoming generation. It need not be. If properly enacted, the legislation could be a blessing to the younger generation of workers, second only to the older generation who are the recipients.

Is it possible for our economic system to bear the burden of paying such pensions suggested in any of the bills now before the Congress? I haven't the least doubt but that it is possible for American economy to support the program of the Landis bill. In the closing hours of the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed what has usually been called the full employment bill, but which ought rightfully and legally to be called the Maximum Employment Act. The politico-economic die-hards said that idea was fantastic and could never be carried out. If they seize and hold political power, nothing may ever come of it. But some of the best brains of America feel that that is a good law and that it is capable of being implemented by government and carried out in effect by agriculture, business, industry, and labor.

For 2 years I sat on the special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning during the war, and we had before us the greatest leaders in industry, Government, and labor. The voluminous hearings were held during the period of the war, indicating what America could have and ought to have after the war. They occupy thousands of pages in print and we heard the greatest minds in Government, in industry, in business, and in labor picture our economic possibilities. Unfortunately we have not yet seen any of these pictures coming true, but surely so many, many practical men could not be wrong. America can do it when motivated for peace as she was motivated for war.

Many textbooks have been written on economics. While libraries embody the thought of our economists, but in all this study the major share of the thought has been given in more recent years to the phase of production—that is, the production of wealth. Now the production of wealth is only one of the fields or the divisions of the science of economics. Too little thought has been paid to an equally important part of economics and that is the consumption of wealth. Production and consumption are really opposite sides of the same thing, but this significant fact apparently has not dawned fully enough upon American businessmen. Our economic society has arrived now, through the use of power, and with the technology and American know-how, to a point so that we can vastly increase the output of material things enough to satisfy to a greater degree than ever before most human wants. However, our economic machine often comes to a slow down, if not a dead stop, because there periodically occurs too little purchasing power to take our abundant production.

How to create that purchasing power to keep our industry and productive equipment working to capacity is our modern problem. We go to great extremes to create markets abroad—and I am not minimizing the importance of foreign trade—but meanwhile we overlook the basic fact that the greatest of all markets is our American home market with purchasing power in the hands of the masses of our people. I believe that this measure, H. R. 781, enacted into law would go a long way toward providing that purchasing power and at the same time it would deal justly by a class of our citizens who deserve to share in the benefits of that which they have helped to create.

---

## Farmers Will Suffer Unless Soil Conservation Appropriation Is Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against the cut made by the Appropriations Committee from the Department of Agriculture's request for $301,720,000 for soil conservation benefits and the elimination of the authorization for $200,000,000 program for 1948 crop.

Benefits from soil conservation are many. First, our productive soil is kept from washing away. It is kept permanently productive for our children's children—in fact, under scientific, acre-by-acre treatment of the farm conservation plan, the fertility of a farm actually increases over the years. This is the kind of soil and water conservation which Louisiana farmers are putting into effect in their own voted and managed soil conservation districts over the greater part of the State. In addition, our whole State and society benefits—business, professions, schools, and churches; local, State, and National Governments—through increased farm incomes taxable wealth and higher revenues.

The bankers of Louisiana give us a good example here in our own State of how business groups recognize the importance of a productive agriculture for the economic stability of our State. They know from actual experience with their customers that fertile topsoil is the basis for agricultural productivity and that once the topsoil is gone, only the inferior subsoil is left. For this reason, the bankers have encouraged the widespread use of soil- and water-conservation practices. Last fall, for example, they requested the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture to conduct a forum in their behalf. Representatives from 28 banking institutions attended the conference at Alexandria, La., on November 18 and 19, 1946.

Of this forum, an editorial in a Louisiana newspaper read:

> Here is realization of the interdependence of farmer and banker. When Louisiana farmers prosper so do most Louisiana communities. * * * For promoting farming and soil conservation in the State the Louisiana Bankers' Association has been cited three times in as many years by the Ameri-

can Bankers' association. Financiers have charted a course many another business group could wisely follow.

More than 90 percent of the entire State is now in the 24 farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil-conservation districts. That is an outstanding accomplishment in the less than 10 years since the Louisiana district enabling act was passed.

Working through their supervisors and with the help of Soil Conservation Service technicians, these farmers have planned the acre-by-acre conservation treatment for more than 2,320,000 acres. Of this, more than 1,248,000 acres have received conservation treatment. This conservation application includes such items as 394,000 acres of contour cultivation, 94,000 acres of strip cropping, nearly 81,000 acres of farm drainage, 630,000 acres of properly stocked range, and nearly 149,000 acres of range and pasture seeding. This is an excellent beginning in conserving our soil resources.

There still remains a tremendous job ahead. A conservation-needs survey made by the Soil Conservation Service in 1945 shows that Louisiana's farms need more conservation work, including 1,731,000 acres of contour planting, 1,822,000 acres of strip cropping, 1,088,000 acres of farm drainage improvement work, 1,469,000 acres of terracing, and about 2,349,000 acres of pasture seeding.

After careful consideration of the cuts made by the Committee on Appropriations from the Department of Agriculture's budget request, it is my unalterable conviction that the farmers would suffer a great burden if this proposal were carried out which would eventually lead to destruction of the entire farm program. As a Representative of the State of Louisiana, with its vast specialized agricultural interests, I am vitally interested in a program that would help our farmers. Louisiana is a great producer of strawberries, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, sugar, rice, peaches, peanuts, cotton, and commercial spring vegetables.

Agriculture is a basic industry in Louisiana. The State's 130,669 farms cover over 10,000,000 acres. Its 853,949 farm people make up 36.1 percent of its population. Including people in small towns, whose welfare depends a good deal on agriculture, the rural population is 1,383,441, or 58.6 percent of the total. Twenty-two commercial fruit and vegetable canneries operated in the State in 1946, seven of them established in 1945 and 1946. Their output amounts to about a million cases a year. Okra, snap beans, sweetpotatoes, spinach, beans, beets, and other vegetables are canned. Sweetpotatoes make up about 60.5 percent of the pack, according to an economic study by the university, and the canning of sweetpotatoes gained over 83 percent in 5 years. One of the methods recommended for increasing the output of canned goods is to draw products from wider area.

Dehydration of sweetpotatoes, developed by the agricultural engineers, has resulted in production of $1,450,000 worth of stock feed, on a basis of comparison with corn. Thirty new dehydrators were installed in 1946. Improved sweetpotato-digging machinery last year saved the farmers 3,000,000 bushels, worth a million and a half dollars. The cost of land drainage can be greatly reduced by use of machinery developed by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the experiment station.

I cannot vote against the agricultural interests of the State of Louisiana and the Congress should realize that the farmers must get the help and consideration to which they are justly entitled.

I urge that the soil-conservation item in the Agriculture appropriation bill be restored to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the President.

---

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expense of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver, upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Ralph L. Harris is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

## PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

---

## PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

---

## DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator, 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 15 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 29, 1947
For actions of May 28, 1947
80th-1st, No. 101


CONTENTS


Agricultural appropriation bill, 1948 (individual items not indexed)..... 1
Appropriations.....1,7
Corporations..... 6
Cotton.....11
Crop insurance.....11
Dairy industry.....13
Debt, public.....24
Expenditures.....17
Flood control.....3,16
Food supply.....18
Forests and forestry....4,9
Fruits and vegetables....19
Housing.....26
Information.....19
Lands, grazing.....15
Nomination..... 8
Personnel..... 2
Prices, farm.....20
Roads.....10
Small business.....22
Soil conservation.....16
Sugar.....25
Taxation.....5
Transportation.....23
War powers.....12
Wool.....21


HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill. Senate passed bill to reduce individual income-tax payments. Sen. Hatch introduced bill to transfer to Interior certain grazing lands acquired by U.S. under various relief and emergency acts.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed, 315-38, this bill, H. R. 3601, with amendments (pp. 6103-81). Just before passage, defeated, 174-180, a Cannon motion to recommit the bill with instructions for the Committee to report it back with amendments to increase ACP from $165,614,290 to $300,000,000, to increase the school lunch program from $45,000,000 to $75,000,000, and to increase REA loans from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000 (pp. 6179-80).

   Agreed to the following amendments:
   - By Rep. Cannon, Mo., 116-109, to increase the Research and Marketing Act item from $6,000,000 to $9,500,000; thus increasing research on utilization and associated problems by $1,500,000, cooperative research other than research on utilization by $500,000, and marketing research under title II by $1,000,000 (pp. 6111-5).*
   - By Rep. Andersen, Minn., to reduce Solicitor's Office from $2,425,000 to $2,025,000 (pp. 6118-9).
   - By Rep. Phillips, Calif., to reduce OFAR from $628,000 to $428,000 (p. 6123).
   - By Rep. Dirksen (for the Committee), to provide $5,300 for repair of BDI facilities damaged by a tornado at Woodward, Okla. (pp. 6128-9).
   - By Rep. Dirksen (for the Committee), to provide $45,600 to replace and repair BPISAE facilities damaged by a tornado at Woodward, Okla. (p. 6129).
   - By Rep. Dirksen, to reinstate the Budget provision for AIC to obtain a tract of surplus land at Pasadena, Calif. (p. 6129).
   - By Rep. Dirksen (for the Committee), to increase market news service by $7,500 for a dairy-products reporter in the Cleveland area (p. 6160).
   - By Rep. Dirksen, to reinstate $40,000,000 of the Sec. 32 money (pp. 6177-8).

*The sub-items in this amendment total only $9,000,000. Later Rep. Dirksen obtained consent for corrections, and Rep. Cannon obtained consent to correct the total on this item to "$9,500,000", so we're not sure which figures will be used.

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Andersen, Minn., to reduce Office of the Secretary from $2,050,000 to $1,800,000; by a 34-92 vote (pp. 6108-10).

By Rep. Bates, Mass., to strike out the prohibition against use of the Research and Marketing Act funds for fish, shellfish, and products thereof; by a 48-60 vote (pp. 6115-8).

By Rep. Hope, Kans., to strike out the provision for meat inspection on a fee basis; by a 114-124 vote (pp. 6123-8).

By Rep. Davis, Wis., to increase the forest-products item from $1,000,000 to $1,555,000; by a 54-81 vote (pp. 6129-31).

By Rep. Cannon, Mo., to increase ACP from $165,614,290 to $300,000,000; by a 151-156 vote (pp. 6136-49).

By Rep. Andersen, Minn., to increase PMA county committees from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000, by an 81-124 vote; after also rejecting a Cannon amendment to this amendment, to increase the item to $23,584,956, by a 118-137 vote (pp. 6148-9).

By Rep. Phillips, Calif., to reduce school lunch program from $45,000,000 to $25,000,000, by an 85-153 vote; rejected a Cannon amendment to this amendment, to increase the item to $75,000,000, by a 139-155 vote; rejected a Buck amendment to the amendment, to decrease the item to $11,470,400 (pp. 6152-9).

By Rep. Whitten, Miss., to provide $25,000,000 for farm-tenant loans; by a 94-129 vote (pp. 6160-3).

By Rep. Whitten, Miss., to increase FHA administrative expenses from $18,000,000 to $25,000,000; by a 93-122 vote (pp. 6163-6).

By Rep. Cannon, Mo., to increase REA loans from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000, by a 144-159 vote; after rejecting, 106-141, a Rankin amendment to increase the item to $300,000,000 (pp. 6168-76). The Cannon and Rankin amendments also provided for an increase of $1,600,000 in REA adm. expense.

During a discussion of FHA, Rep. Cooley inserted a letter from Secretary Anderson defending this program (p. 6121). Rep. Phillips, Calif., submitted an amendment to increase marketing agreements and orders from $525,300 to $725,300, but withdrew the amendment, anticipating that the Senate will provide for financing this item from Sec. 32 (p. 6159).

Remarks in Appendix on the bill by Rep. Granger, Utah, on the effect of reductions for the agricultural-conservation program (pp. A2682-4); Rep. Jarman, Ala., criticizing reduction in funds for research, farm tenant, school-lunch, and AAA programs (pp. A2681-2); Rep. D'Ewart, Mont., opposing reduction in forest-highway funds (p. A2684); Rep. Combs, Tex., urging additional funds for REA (p. A2684); and Rep. Miller, Nebr., supporting REA programs and the bill in general (pp. A2684-5).

In addition to statements made during consideration of amendments: Rep. Abernethy, Miss., spoke in favor of economy but objected to decreases in ACP, research, REA, FHA, Sec. 32, SCS, school-lunch program (pp. 6103-6). Rep. Rankin, Miss., spoke in favor of additional REA funds (pp. 6107-8). Rep. Murray, Wis., spoke in support of the Sec. 32 cut (p. 6108). Rep. Cooley, N.C., objected to FHA cuts (pp. 6120-2). Reps. Flannagan, Va., and Allen, La., objected to FS cuts (pp. 6131-3). Rep. Jensen, Iowa, spoke against SCS reduction (pp. 6134-5). Rep. Hope, Kans., spoke in support of the PMA county committees (p. 6151). Reps. Hill and Chenoweth, Colo., spoke in support of the Sugar Act program (p. 6152). Rep. Hull, Wis., objected to REA, FHA, and school-lunch reductions (pp. 6163-5). Rep. Hoeven, Iowa, criticized ACP, SCS, and Sec. 32 cuts (p. 6134).

PERSONNEL. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H.R. 1845, to provide for military leave for Federal employees who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps (H.Rept. 483) (p. 6182).

FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Bolton, Ohio, discussed loss of food through floods and included a London Sunday Express article on the subject (p. 6182).

Received from the War Department preliminary flood control reports on Greenwich Harbor (Conn.), Rock Hall Harbor (Md.), Gila River (Ariz. and Mo.), and Little Sioux River (Iowa) (H. Docs. 272, 273, 274, 275) (pp. 6181-2).

NATIONAL FORESTS. Received a Calif. Legislature memorial opposing H.R. 2876, to create a Redwood National Park and national forest area in Calif. (p. 6182).

SENATE

TAXATION. Passed, 52-34, with amendments H.R. 1, the individual income tax-reduction bill (pp. 6068-100). Sens. Millikin, Taft, Butler, George, and Barkley were appointed conferees (p. 6100). House conferees not yet appointed.

CORPORATIONS. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures a report on the assets of 28 active wholly-owned Government corporations and their subsidiaries, 1947, showing total assets of $15,698,089,707. To Appropriations Committee. (p. 6067.)

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Sen. Hayden, Ariz., submitted the minority views of the Appropriations Committee on this bill, H.R. 2436 (S. Rept. 201, pt. 2) (p. 6067).

NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Robert A. Lovett to be Under Secretary of State (pp. 6069, 6100).

NATIONAL FORESTS. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution opposing H.R. 2876, to create a Redwood National Park and a national forest area in Calif.(p. 6065)

HIGHWAYS. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging that continued Federal appropriations be made to aid the States in the development of highways(p.6066).

CROP INSURANCE. Received an Okla. Legislature resolution urging that funds be made available to pay the 1946 cotton crop losses of the farmers of Okla. who had Federal crop insurance (p. 6066).

BILLS INTRODUCED

WAR POWERS. H.R. 3647, by Rep. Michener, Mich. (by request), to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 6182.)

DAIRY PRODUCTS. H.R. 3646, by Rep. Johnson, Ill., to provide equitable relief to contractors supplying dairy products to armed forces. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 6182.)

HIGHWAYS. H.R. 3660, by Rep. Hand, N.J., to establish a National Superhighway Commission in order to provide for the making of plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system. To Public Works Committee.(p.6182.

GRAZING LANDS. S. 1359, by Sen. Hatch, N. Mex., providing for the administration by the Bureau of Land Management of certain lands in certain western States, valuable for grazing, acquired by the U.S. under the various relief

and emergency acts. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 6067.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Angell, Oreg., inserted David C. Warner's (Ohio Public Works Dept.) statement on flood control and soil conservation needs in Ohio (pp. A2664-5).

17. EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Springer, Ind., urging reduction in Federal expenditures and inserting an Indianapolis Star editorial on the subject (pp. A2667-8).

18. FOOD SUPPLY. Rep. Macy, N.Y., inserted his recent address on national resources referring particularly to food supplies and protesting destruction of potato surpluses (pp. A2673-4).

19. INFORMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bryson, S.C., commending the Fruits and Vegetable Market News service (p. A2676).

20. FARM PRICES. Rep. Judd, Minn., inserted Chester D. Tripp's discussion of agricultural prices (pp. A2676-7).

21. WOOL. Sen. Hatch, N.Mex., inserted a Washington Evening Star editorial opposing the House version of the wool bill and relating to some of the problems that confront the wool growers (p. A2658).

22. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Patman, Tex., commending the RFC program for loans to small business (pp. A2658-9).

23. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Rep. Butler, N.Y., inserted a Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks' letter opposing this project (pp. A2665-6).

24. PUBLIC DEBT. Rep. Dirksen, Ill., inserted his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee presenting a plan to reduce the public debt (pp.A2669-72).

25. SUGAR RATIONING. Rep. Rogers, Mass., inserted Harold L. Ickes' article criticizing the sugar-rationing program (pp. A2675-6).

26. HOUSING. Rep. Dirksen, Ill., inserted an analysis by M.D. Bodfish and A.Ferguson of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill (pp. A2685-6).

- o -

COMMITTEE-HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for May 29: S. Agriculture, fertilizer bill (Anderson to testify); S. Foreign Relations, St. Lawrence Seaway; S. Small Business, steel hearings; S. Labor and Public Welfare, Taft health bill; H. Agriculture, long-range farm program; H. Banking and Currency, RFC extension; H. Education and Labor, Federal aid to education; H. Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reorganization plans 1 and 2; H. Post Office and Civil Service, bills reported by subcommittees (ex.); H. Public Lands, mining bills (Sieker to testify); H. Rules, Minerals Resources Division; H. Ways and Means, general tax revision.

- o -

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 113 Adm. Arrangements may be made to be kept advised, routinely, of developments on any particular bill.

maintenance rations could be fed to dairy herds, and the milk output is known to have fallen substantially.

"Nearly 100,000 acres of winter wheat have had to be written off as a total loss.

"Upward of a hundred thousand tons of potatoes have been lost to human consumption.

"To repair the ravages as quickly as possible and put the land into a condition to grow food for this year's harvests is a race against time.

"All possible steps are being taken to clear the land of water, but without financial help many of the farmers who have lost so much already will not be in a position to tackle their part of the job.

"The National Farmers' Union, therefore, has decided to launch an appeal for contributions to its agricultural disaster fund. The proceeds of this fund will be devoted to mitigating the crippling nature of the losses.

"The damage is so great that the agricultural industry alone cannot cover the whole of the cost. In consultation with the Government a fully representative national committee is being set up to administer the fund and a similar committee will be appointed for each county.

"The purpose of this fund is to mitigate, as far as possible, the effects of the weather catastrophe on the food situation. The appeal does not cover the ordinary household and personal losses due to the floods, which are the province of the appeal issued by the Lord Mayor of London. The two appeals will not conflict.

"The union adds that the urgency of the appeal cannot be overestimated. Everyone in any way connected with agriculture should send a donation as quickly as possible to the Agricultural Disaster Fund, National Farmers' Union, 45 Bedford Square, London, W. C. 1."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed this bill and the accompanying report and am particularly concerned regarding some of the recommendations that affect appropriations for our Federal activities in forest conservation. The conservation idea and the need for Federal leadership to advance it received its first great impetus in the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt. From time to time both parties have further implemented the movement but never to the extent warranted by its importance.

We are now well into the adjustment period of the postwar era and are striving desperately to build the foundations for a sound economy geared to new conditions. We are seeking to build up our national strength to meet new responsibilities at home and abroad. Natural resources, which have always played such an important part in our industrial development, have been severely depleted by the war and also by peacetime years of wasteful exploitation. We have a tremendous job of rehabilitation to undertake in connection with forest resources. In view of this situation I question whether this is not the time to strengthen rather than weaken Federal leadership in conservation.

In reducing appropriations to the United States Forest Service by nearly $16,000,000 we are not striking at some temporary wartime activity for which a need no longer exists, but at the heart of the conservation movement in the United States. It is difficult to understand in what way the public interest is served by withholding increased funds to administer sales of national forest timber at a time of unprecedented demand. What possible public interest is served by completely wiping out funds for the administration of wildlife resources on national forests? A large segment of our people are fishermen and the building up of this form of recreation is inevitably a responsibility of land managing agencies. Are we to understand that this field is to be neglected or handled only incidentally by the largest single land managing agency in the United States? Similar questions could be asked regarding other appropriation actions in the bill as they bear on the administration of our national forests.

In my own region, we have millions of acres producing wood products at only a fraction of the rate at which they are capable of growing it. Our forest industries and land owners are struggling with many problems incident to a shift from the wasteful liquidation policy of past years to one of conservation and management. We are seriously hampered in our efforts by lack of knowledge and information in this new philosophy of forest management. Our forests suffer not only from lack of good management practices but also from damages by insects and disease which good management could do much to control. The information and techniques required to put my region back on its feet as a leading forest products region stems from research.

I am particularly concerned by the heavy reduction in funds for the forest survey. This basic inventory of forest resources is essential to the sound planning of conservation program by both Government and private agencies. In areas where it has been under way for some time industry has time and again consulted the results of this survey for guidance in the establishment of new enterprises and the development of policies.

We need this survey in the Northeast and I am concerned over any action that will present a hazard to the early prosecution of this work.

We have a large number of small forest industries in our territory which need the guidance of research in forest products. Our large industries have profited in the past by the results of Federal research in forest products. A vital part of the conservation concept is the fuller use of what resources we have and a reduction in research along these lines is not consistent with sound economy.

For these reasons I am concerned that the report on this bill recommends reductions in appropriations for vitally important phases of research in forestry. This recommendation certainly is not in accord with the current recognition of the needs for an aggressive program of scientific research which has already been recognized by the Congress in other fields.

My vote for this bill will be with great reluctance. I am not satisfied that the effects of reductions affecting forest conservation have been fully appraised and I question whether at this time we can afford to weaken Federal leadership in a movement of such significance to our national welfare.

FILING OF SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill H. R. 673.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article from the New York Times.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the economy of this country is anchored to agriculture. Only a casual glance into the economic history of agriculture will definitely reveal that it sets and controls the patterns of the varied and sundry industries of America. The agricultural resources of the United States are second to that of no other section of the world. Agriculture is the very backbone of American industry and, more important at this particular time, to it the entire world looks for food and clothing. It is an accepted fact that prospering agriculture procreates a general prosperity. Conversely, a stagnant economy trails its failure.

How do we account for this? It is due entirely to the fact that the millions upon millions of farm families spread out and across every county and State of these United States constitute the largest, most desirable and most immediate market for all American industry. It is a market which prevails the year around for all products of every kind and of every character, whether they be automobiles or trucks, hardware or household goods, petroleum or electrical appliances—everything of every kind made by American industry and American labor. Strike down their prosperity and you strike down the prosperity of more than 140,000,000 American people. This is an irrefutable fact. Time and time again it has happened. It can

happen again. And it will happen again if this agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 3601, and others like it, are meted out to the hardest working group of people on the face of this planet—the American farmers.

Why, Mr. Chairman, what have our farm people done to deserve the treatment which they are given by this legislation? Can we not recall that it has only been a few years since we stripped the farms of their young men and sent them away to fight the battles for freedom. The farms were left in the hands of their fathers and mothers who produced the food and fiber necessary to win a great war. Many of them were aged. Many were physically unable to toil the long hours essential to the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of crops. Farm work is hard work. But they did the job. And they did it with a shortage of labor, a shortage of fertilizer, a shortage of machinery, a shortage of everything but a courage and a will to back their sons who had gone away to war, many of whom never returned. Never before in the annals of American agriculture has there been such an abundance of production—enough to feed and clothe the entire world. For the farm folk there were no strikes, no shut-downs, no sit-downs, nothing but work, work, work. And, as they were going about this great achievement they were fast depleting and bleeding white the fertility of their soil. By good practices under the skillful supervision of the Soil Conservation Service, this fertility can be restored. Cripple the program, as this bill will do, and you turn your back on the great sacrifice which the farm people of this country made to win a great war.

It has not been so many years, Mr. Chairman, since you could purchase with one $20 bill almost all the corn or wheat or cotton one man could produce in a year's crop. And when that situation plagued the American farmer, like the cancer it is, it ate away the stability of every other segment of American industry. They were left with a short market. Ordinarily you would think that we had learned our lesson, that we had become wiser and would profit from our ignorance and mistakes of the past. But apparently that is not the case, at least with many in our midst, for here today we have the majority party, the Republican Party, now most favored by our farm people, sabotaging the Department of Agriculture and driving agricultural industry back to those bleak, dark days of the early thirties.

I ask you again, why this treatment for our farm folk? What have they done to merit such? Have they not met all production goals set by the Department of Agriculture? Beyond the South, last year, possibly in a forgetful moment—and for this we forgive them—did they not vote overwhelmingly Republican? Sure they did. Then why is the Republican Party meting out to them such treatment as is proposed in this bill? There could be but one reason and that, Mr. Chairman, is to smooth the way for the Knutson tax-relief bill—the bill which evidences the great love and affection which the Republican Party harbors for those who are so "unfortunate" as to have incomes of "only" $300,000 or more per annum. Its love for this group is a fact which everyone so well knows but so often forgets.

REPUBLICANS PRAISE THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

For the soil conservation, rural electrification, tenant purchase, agricultural research, school lunch, and other agricultural programs the Republicans have heretofore had but the highest praise. Also their support. But on the other hand they have promised that $300,000-a-year man that they were going to reduce his taxes whereby his take-home income would be increased more than $40,000 per year over that at present. And these "unfortunate" people have put the squeeze on our Republican friends to fulfill that promise. In order to carry it out they are going to kick the slats out of the Department of Agriculture and the American farmer. Well, they may do it but they will rue the day when they do.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I have heard Member after Member on the Republican side bemoan the American dollars which the so-called New Deal administration was pouring into Europe for relief. And simultaneously they have bemoaned the fact that we do so little for our own people. On this proposition I noticed an interesting contrast which appeared on the front page of a local daily newspaper under date of May 22. In one column I found the headline, "Agriculture budget cut 38 percent, House subcommittee lops off four hundred millions," and lo and behold, in another column appeared the headline, "House votes three hundred and fifty millions foreign relief." The relief bill passed the House 288 to 86. The dissenting votes are only about one-third the voting strength of the Republicans in the House, and by no means were all of those 86 dissenters Republicans. Now I am not going to quarrel with those who feel that America, two long years after the war and after two full crops have been made in Europe, should continue to feed and clothe the people of Europe. I do not agree with you, and I voted accordingly. But I do say that you should not make the American farmer pay the entire bill. It is not just and it is not fair.

We all recognize the interest which every American has in maintaining the fertility of our soil, our greatest natural resource. Most of our people own no farm land but upon the land and its productivity are each and all of us dependent for our food and clothing. We were late in awakening to the fact that our soils were being fast depleted through erosion, bad farming practices, and so forth. But we did realize the seriousness of the situation in time to about-face and in time to safeguard the fertility of our soils for ourselves and for generations yet unborn. This was accomplished through the soil-conservation program, which, as everyone knows, proposes from year to year certain sound farm practices for which the Government, as an incentive, pays about one-third of the cost through the AAA. The soil being our greatest natural resource and it being essential that it be preserved for posterity, I think it good business for the Government to offer the incentive payments.

COMMITMENT FOR 1947 AAA PAYMENTS

Last year the Congress wrote into the agricultural appropriation bill language whereby there could be no misunderstanding as to what amount the Government would expend in the program. It was made crystal clear that the amount would be $300,000,000 for AAA payments and administrative costs. Agricultural agents of this Government set up the 1947 program to fit the pattern and told the American farmer what the Congress had agreed to do by contract—signed, sealed, and delivered. Now here at this eleventh hour, the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee brings to the floor of this House a bill which would, in face of that solemn agreement, reduce the Government's participation to $165,000,000. The cut amounts to approximately one-third of the European relief bill they passed last week. So, the American farmer is not only going to be called upon to put up some of the food for this relief but also to pay one-third of the bill with the AAA payments which we pledged to him last year. I, for one, will not break faith with our farm people and will certainly vote for the amendment to restore the full appropriation.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mr. Chairman, I am astounded and surprised that my Republican friends would cut the appropriation one dime below the budget estimate for agricultural research. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture which wrote and presented to the Seventy-ninth Congress the agricultural research bill—the so-called Hope-Flannagan Act, in honor of the distinguished gentleman and the present chairman of my great committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and my distinguished friend and former chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. There was no politics in the writing and passage of that bill. It had the unanimous support of our committee, of the Congress and President Truman.

Every segment of American industry is carrying on extensive research except agriculture, which is far behind. For year after year prior to the war, we were producing great surpluses of agricultural products. For the potential surpluses, new uses must be found, and this particularly applies to cotton. I do not know as much about the problem in your section as I do in mine, but I am sure that yours is no different from mine. In the South we are making rapid strides in crop rotation and industrial development. But, irrespective of the latter, the South is naturally an agricultural country and better adapted to the growing of cotton than any other crop. It is a great crop. It has many uses. But for it, other uses can and must be found. In the research bill we have placed our hope. Adequate appropriations to carry on the work could mean for us the difference between prosperity or bankruptcy. The amount sought—only

$9,500,000—is infinitesimal compared with the national budget. And I hope you will support the amendment to be offered to restore the $3,500,000 cut in the appropriation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. Chairman, the greatest service this Government rendered the man on the farm was bringing electricity—lights and power—to his home. Through the Rural Electrification Administration many have been afforded the comforts of power, but on the whole we have only scratched the surface. I want to see every farm home in this country electrified. And I thought that the Republican members of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee shared a similar feeling. Evidently I am mistaken, for they have cut the budget request for rural-electrification loans by more than $25,000,000 and reduced the administrative funds by 28½ percent. I am reliably informed that this will seriously slow down the work in REA, create bottlenecks in the consideration of applications, and mean that 25-percent fewer farm people can receive electricity in 1948 than if these cuts were restored, and this is a conservative figure. It has been well said that REA will not use any more money than it needs, so why should not the Congress give it an adequate loan authorization? I want to see electricity wired into every farm home in my district, as well as yours; and I would like to see it get there before some of our people get too old to use it. They have waited a long, long time. So, please gentlemen, let us all join together in making an adequate appropriation for rural electrification. The money appropriated will be paid back to the Government with interest, and the farms electrified will be increased in value. REA pays its way; it is self-sustaining and self-liquidating. Let us not hamper or hamstring the activity of the Rural Electrification Administration in its effort and activity toward electrifying every farm home in America.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

I also deplore the complete elimination of the farm tenant purchase program of the Farmers Home Administration. In this program hundreds and thousands of our veterans are looking to the opportunity of home and farm ownership. And unless you restore these funds then they will have no other real source to which they may resort for this assistance. The Farmers Home Administration has helped many of our people to become home owners and substantial citizens. It is sheer nonsense to cut the throat of the program in the name of economy when it is good economy to offer reasonable assistance to be repaid to those who are earnestly striving toward a substantial position in life.

There are other false economies in this bill. Many of them. Many have been developed by previous speakers. Others will be developed by those to follow. I hope you will join with us in eliminating the many wrongs done the American farmer.

FOR ECONOMY

I want to say now and have it definitely understood that you Republicans have no monopoly on economy. The record since the war discloses many reductions and rescissions of appropriations by a Democratic Congress. I have in many instances voted for reductions and I shall vote for others but I refuse to cut the heart out of the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. This is not economy. It is sabotage.

I favor the elimination of duplication. I favor the elimination of overlapping agencies. I favor dismissal of its many unnecessary high-paid executives, supervisors, and administrators. These things the bill will not accomplish. On the contrary, judging by previous actions of other departments, these high executives will be retained and the lay-offs made at the local level. There is nothing seriously wrong with the agricultural programs. The trouble is that these high executives make the cost unnecessarily high. Economy should be practiced at the high level, and I favor such. But in this bill we find our Republican friends sabotaging the programs instead of reducing the cost. This is, indeed, poor economy.

CONCLUSION

When we look back upon the early thirties we recall 38-cent wheat, 32-cent corn, 16-cent oats, 3-cent hogs, 4-cent beef, and 6-cent cotton. It makes me shudder to think of it. Since then, under a good farm program, we have come a long way. Our farm people are fairly prosperous again. They offer a market now for hundreds of thousands of automobiles and trucks, for 200,000 tractors a year, for more than $400,000,000 worth of household goods, building materials of more than a billion dollars' worth, and so on, and on and on. They are not the same people that you knew 15 years ago. They are prosperous, content, and happy. So are all of us. But legislation of this character will drive them back to a depression economy and the rest of America will go back with them. Let us not act too hurriedly, else we turn back to the dark days of years gone by.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to announce that on yesterday when the Committee rose the first paragraph of the bill had been read, and the reading of the bill will be resumed with the second paragraph.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The pending agricultural appropriations bill represents a betrayal of the American farmer by the Republican majority in the House of Representatives. Democratic members of the Appropriations Committee did what they could to prevent this ill-considered measure from coming to the floor. Last Friday, when the full Committee on Appropriations met to give final consideration to the measure, we demanded and secured 12 roll-call votes in committee in an effort to stop the steam roller of the majority, but to no avail. They had the votes. Let it be said for the record, that when the roll call was taken on reporting the bill every Democrat on the committee, with possibly one exception, voted against the bill.

During my brief service in the House of Representatives I had never seen that happen before. It would not have happened had there not been something drastically wrong with the bill. Why is this bill so unattractive, so unacceptable to the friends of agriculture? Why do I say that it is a slap in the face for the American farmer? Is it because the bill provides certain economies? No. Democrats favor economies in administration and other savings wherever they can safely be made. There are numerous economies in the bill which I favor and stand ready to defend. But here are some of the reasons why the bill is so intolerable. Some of these facts should be made crystal clear in the outset of this debate today.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Last year Congress passed the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act, which was hailed by friends of agriculture as perhaps the most important forward step in agriculture within a generation. The President asked for the coming year the sum of $19,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this legislation. What happened? The bill before us provides the wholly inadequate sum of $6,000,000 for this purpose.

I am a member of the War Department Subcommittee, which on tomorrow will report out the annual Military Establishment's bill, requiring something over $5,000,000,000. In that bill more than $200,000,000 will be requested for research and development. We are providing this year in the Navy for a research and development program which will cost $34,000,000. Yes; we are being asked to provide $250,000,000 for atomic research, but this pending bill denies the relatively small amount requested for research under the Hope-Flannagan Act for the basic industry of America, and I, for one, will not support such a short-sighted and indefensible policy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I happened to be a member of the committee which reported the bill to which the gentleman has referred, which was named in honor of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and our former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. Is it not a fact that every Member of the House voted for the bill when it passed last year?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct in his statement.

SECTION 32

This bill does great violence to the cause of agriculture in repudiating the section 32 provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 32 provides that 30 percent of tariff receipts may be used to dispose of agricultural surpluses and otherwise promote the cause of agriculture. After all, the tariff protects industry and makes it necessary for the farmer to pay a higher price for many of the things required on the farm and why should not a portion of the tariff receipts be used in the interest of the farmer. Section 32 is one of the most effective provisions for agriculture ever written into law—past achievements prove that

point—and the provision in this bill which nullifies that law is a step toward a prostrate and bankrupt agriculture. That is another reason why I join with others in crying out against this measure now before us.

AAA PAYMENTS

The bill provides $164,000,000 for the so-called AAA soil-conservation payments instead of the $300,000,000 requested by the President. If the $300,000,000 is not provided, the farmer will be shamefully betrayed. That is true because Congress will have broken the pledged word of the Government to the American farmer, and in my book a breach of faith cannot be defended in the name of economy or any other name.

It is not a question of whether the AAA program is good or bad. Many Members of Congress and many dirt farmers differ as to the merits of the program. It can be agreed that the AAA program is far from perfect. But my point is that when the farmer began his 1947 crop he had a right to believe that the $300,000,000 program would be carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. If we consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the proceedings of the House of Representatives on March 8, 1946, we read where the House pledged itself to carry out the $300,000,000 program. If we consult the President's budget message, which was made public in January, the beginning of the crop year, we find the President makes reference to "the $300,000,000 program to which we are committed for the crop year 1947."

Mr. Chairman, the full amount promised for the AAA program should be provided. The question is not an involved problem of policy, but a simple question of good faith.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The bill provides a reduction of $6,000,000 in funds requested by the President to carry out the soil-conservation program. This will have a crippling effect on the programs of soil-conservation districts throughout the Nation. I trust the House will restore these funds and thereby contribute to the success of one of the important forward movements in the field of agriculture.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The school-lunch program is crippled by the bill—cut approximately in half. There are differences of opinion as to the merits of this program. I personally feel that the program has great possibilities and that it should be continued, with the local communities and States assuming an increasing responsibility for the success of the activity.

FARM TENANT PURCHASE PROGRAM

The bill before us completely repudiates the program which we started some time ago to make home owners out of farm tenants, the farm tenant purchase program. There is not a dime in the bill for it. Land prices are high; it is a perilous thing to go into the purchase of farm land but certainly it was unwise for the committee completely to strike from the bill any funds for carrying on that program. I stand with those who believe that a sound American agricultural economy demands farm ownership and I am not willing to stop that program. I shall support an amendment to continue the farm tenant purchase program.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

As to the REA program I should like to say this: The cut in administrative expenses is too deep and will have a tendency to hamper the successful handling of the program. Earlier in the year threats were made to the effect that the President's request for $225,000,000 in loan funds to local REA cooperatives would be slashed. Fortunately, we have been able to prevent that being done. Yet the bill should be amended to provide an additional $25,000,000 in REA loans to meet the original requirement which is diminished by reason of the transfer of REA financing from the RFC to the Treasury Department.

Mr. Chairman, in the time at my disposal there is no opportunity for me to discuss all the aspects of the bill in which I am interested and I must conclude. Again I protest the ill-considered and unwise provisions in this measure, and urge that it be modified along the lines suggested. It is imperative that the friends of agriculture cooperate together in keeping faith with the agricultural producers of the Nation. A sound and prosperous agriculture is essential to the Nation's well-being.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on Thursday and Friday of last week, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] attacked the operations of the New York Stock Exchange, and announced that he was about to introduce two bills which would discourage the short selling which he claims has taken place recently. I regret that I was not on the floor of the House at the time to answer the gentleman. Having been a stock broker for 30 years, I feel confident that I am qualified to defend the stock exchange and its operations.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], on Thursday, "Where is your Securities and Exchange Commission that has been established to see that these things do not happen?"

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] boasts that it was through his efforts that the SEC was established. Does he now repudiate the Commission which, he asserts, was brought into being by his valiant crusade?

The gentleman belongs, I am afraid to say to that New Deal school of thought which believes in getting the Federal Government into every possible phase of American life. He does not seem to realize that the people are fed up with the Government controls and regulations with which we have been hampered during the past 13 years. I, myself, was amazed at the number of people who called me when I was in Philadelphia over the week-end, to protest Mr. SABATH's savage and unwarranted attack.

The gentleman will not get far with his bill to provide revenue from the short sales of shares of stock, grains, cotton, or other allied commodities, or his bill to prohibit communication of false information with respect to securities in certain cases. Not only is there no need for them or for the asinine remarks which accompanied their presentation on the floor of the House, but public opinion is against him.

Mr. Chairman, to prove my point I include an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Saturday, May 24, 1947. I should also like to insert in the RECORD a dispatch which was transmitted over the Dow-Jones news ticker relative to the gentleman's speech on stock market manipulations.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 24, 1947]

SHOULD PUT UP OR SHUT UP

There is no excuse for Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH's savage attack on current New York Stock Exchange operations, which he has seen fit to describe as "outrageous, crooked dealings."

Wall Street has long been a favorite target of empty-headed politicians when they have run out of other topics, but Mr. SABATH's comprehensive denunciation is too vicious to be dismissed as run-of-the-mill political oratory. His statements and predictions are the kind that no one should be allowed to get away with.

When he says, "If we don't stop the short selling and gambling on the New York Stock Exchange we'll have disaster in this country," and that he is "fearful that the same thing that took place in 1929 to 1932 will take place again unless we put a stop to it," he is going off the deep end.

Emil Schram, president of the New York Stock Exchange, has made the only possible retort in demanding that SABATH either present proof of crooked dealings or withdraw his charges. Prices on the exchange are established through open transactions. The market is regulated by a Government agency, the securities and exchange commission, which also make the rules to regulate short-selling.

If the Congressman has any justifiable complaints he should make them to the SEC and not engage in wild, reckless and completely unsupported statements that can only do severe damage to a legitimate institution and legitimate dealings in securities. He should put up or shut up.

---

[From Dow-Jones news ticker]

STOCK MARKET

NEW YORK.—Representative SABATH, Democrat, Illinois, yesterday charged that dishonest manipulation has caused the recent stock market decline.

The stock exchange quickly denied the accusation and demanded proof.

Emil Schram, the Exchange's president, in a wire to Representative SABATH, invited him to present factual proof of manipulative activities on the exchange.

He added, "If you do not have any factual information, I think that you should in all decency withdraw what you have said. Reckless statements of the character you have just put out are damaging to our public institutions."

Representative SABATH, in a statement on the House floor, attacked short selling and said he would introduce today a bill which

will impose a tax of 5 percent on short selling. He also said such sales should be abolished.

In answer to this, Mr. Schram's telegram declared that, "Short selling is strictly regulated under our rules and those of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Copies of these regulations are available to you.

"Credit regulations are in the hands of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. You can, of course, address your complaints on that score to that agency. We feel here that one of the causes of recent weakness in our market is the discriminatory restraint upon loans to millions of people who own securities listed on the national registered exchanges."

In Philadelphia, the Securities and Exchange Commission said it had received complaint on short selling from Representative SABATH. It added that it would answer the letter but had no further comment to make.

It was recalled that Representative SABATH had sent a somewhat similar letter to the Commission following the break in the market on September 3 last. A spokesman said the Commission is constantly watching the market and is always on the alert for indications of manipulation.

The Commission has not sent out any general questionnaires on stock-market trading since the one which was issued following the break on September 3.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I recall the gentleman from Massachusetts broke in to say that stock on the stock exchange had dropped 75 percent from last November. I have checked it and I think the gentleman will agree with me when I say that 50 leading stocks have dropped 2 points and 90 stocks have risen 1 point during that same time.

Mr. McGARVEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes, as the gentleman did, because I think I know a little something about the laws that are administered by the SEC.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, as far as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is concerned, he can defend himself; but I remember in the late twenties and in the early thirties the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] was one of the first men in this House or in the country to call attention to what was going on in the great stock exchanges of the United States. I think I have a right to speak about this matter because I happen to be the author of the three measures that are now administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission—the Securities Act of 1933, the Stock Exchange Act of 1934, and the Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935.

A department of the Government made the statement that from 1922 to 1932 there had been issued and offered to the public in the United States about fifty billion in securities and that their judgment was twenty-five billion of them were not worth the paper upon which they were written; yet, some of these people who had been issuing these kind of securities came down here and said that we were going to stop the issuance of securities. We passed a bill and every decent dealer of securities in the United States felt like his stable was clean and that he could, therefore, put his securities on the market.

They also came down and said that the stock exchange regulation bill would close all the exchanges in the country. One president of the New York Stock Exchange since that bill was passed said he would not be chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, or president, or whatever you want to call it, unless that bill was upon the statute books. And it went along until the Holding Company Act of 1935. We were going to put all the private utility companies in the United States out of business, and today there is not a decent operating utility in the country that is not glad to have these giant holding companies taken off its back so that it can operate at a decent rate to the public and pay its stockholders.

How did these giant holding companies make their money? There are only two ways on earth that one of these giant holding companies can make money. One is by the manipulation of stocks, to which it lends itself perfectly, and the other is by milking the operating companies at the bottom, because the operating companies are the only ones in the whole set-up that can make money. So, it matters not what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says about operating on the New York Stock Exchange. I have been operating with them, not on them, for 10 or 12 years, and I say to you that even though we have the Securities and Exchange Commission with power and authority to look into these things, that somebody has got to be on the watchtower in a time like this, or we may sink back once more into the same condition that brought about the debacle of 1929.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of expedition, I think we ought to read the next paragraph. We have had two speeches out of order now, and I will be constrained to object to other similar requests.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will not the gentlemen let the next paragraph be read?

Mr. RANKIN. They took 10 or 15 minutes talking about the stock exchange. Now, the most grievous error in this bill has not been mentioned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A strict construction of the rule would indicate that all argument on the pro forma amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman made a motion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. Chairman; just a suggestion that we read the next paragraph.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not the rule of the House, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois. On pro forma amendments, the debate has not been exhausted. I have been trying to get recognition here for 10 or 15 minutes, and I have seen the floor taken in speaking about stock exchanges pro and con. I would like to talk about a matter that affects the farmers of this Nation. I move to strike out the last word, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to talk about what seems to be the forgotten man, the American farmer. The greatest programs that have ever been instituted for the benefit of the American farmers are soil conservation and rural electrification. I want to talk to you for a moment about rural electrification, for which I have been battling for the last 15 years.

This bill cuts down the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, even though the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget itself is far below what is necessary to carry on the electrification program for the next fiscal year.

Now, remember, we are still behind, far behind, even Japan in rural electrification. While they have 90 percent of their farms electrified and while Germany has 90 percent of her farms electrified and while Italy and France have 94 percent of their farms electrified, we have only a little more than 57.4 percent of our farms electrified.

The farmers of this Nation, in almost every State of the Union, are appealing and pleading for funds to build rural power lines. Every dollar of this money comes back with interest. The Government does not lose a dime.

Besides, it invariably doubles the value of every farm it touches, in providing conveniences, relieving drudgery, preserving foods, promoting health, and inspiring hope. It is the greatest program ever instituted for the benefit of the rural people of this Nation. I want to call your attention to the fact again that there was a larger percentage of American farm boys who went into this war than there were any other class of people in the United States. Now they have come back and are undertaking to make a living under adverse conditions, when the farmer pays more for what he buys, according to the price he gets for what he sells, than he has probably in all the history of this country.

This is not giving the farmer anything. We are merely making it possible for him to help himself.

You provide here for only $225,000,000 for the next fiscal year. On the 1st day of July, the very day of the beginning of the new fiscal year, there will be $270,000,000 in applications before the Rural Electrification Administration, and they are pouring in at the rate of $30,000,000 a month. Are we going to pour out money to feed every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu at the expense of these farmers and then deny them the benefits of rural electrification? Do you think you are going to get intelligent farmers in your district to move out onto the farm or to stay on the farm and do the hard work necessary to produce the materials to feed and clothe the Nation unless you at least put them on a parity with the farmers of Japan, Germany, France, and Italy by giving them the benefits of electric power?

Do you think you are going to get the farm women, who are today bowing down

over the washtubs in your districts, doing the most burdensome work that any woman ever did, to stay on the farm when they are denied even the opportunity to run an electric washing machine or to operate an electric fan, to say nothing of the lights, water pump, refrigerator, and other necessary appliances? If you do, you are badly mistaken. Do not misunderstand it.

That is not the program you were elected on last November. I told you then it was not a Republican victory, but just a delousing of the Democratic Party.

The American people are expecting us to represent them, but you have gone on and punished the people of the South and the West with the most damnable and discriminatory freight rates the world ever saw. You can ship goods from New York to San Francisco cheaper than you can put them off in Kansas, Iowa, or Nebraska, and vice versa, because the Interstate Commerce Commission up until now, at least, has been in the grip of the transcontinental railroads and big interests in certain sections of the country. Do you think you are going to continue that program and go out and fool the American farmer into sending you back to Congress?

At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment not only to restore the cut, but to provide the funds necessary to meet the demands for rural electrification in every State in this Union for the next fiscal year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly how much the New York Stock Exchange has gone up or down, but I do know about $2 has gone off the price of 100 pounds of milk out in Wisconsin, even though we have a Steagall amendment that is supposed to be in operation.

I think it is appropriate at this time to call your attention to the fact that there is every reason to believe that a lot of this interest in the section 32 funds comes from the fact that certain parts of agriculture have been on the gravy train all these years, and they can see that someone is liable to shove them off for the benefit of the rest of agriculture. I will prove that statement by calling your attention to the fact that during a 10-year period what crops do we find that have the benefit of the section 32 funds? I might say to begin with that one of the objections I have always had to the so-called New Deal agricultural program is that I have always felt that it was upside down. They talked about a soil-conservation program, but what they did was use public funds to promote soil-depleting crops at the expense of livestock farming, the best-known agricultural system for soil conservation. You could not get a better example than is shown in the use of these funds. The other day some of my friends wanted to kill the sheep business in this country, according to the speeches they made, and yet $40,000,000 out of this $125,000,000 or $130,000,000 of section 32 funds comes from money collected on wool last year coming into the United States of America on livestock products. What do they use that for? We started out and used $154,000,000 of it during the last 10-year period for cotton. Remember, my good cotton friends may talk about reciprocity. They are strong for these reciprocity agreements. They build a wall up around the American cotton farmer and the American cotton market. They put an embargo on imports. They take section 32 funds and get 30 percent of the custom receipts on livetsock products coming into this country by lowering the tariff and other devices and use it on soil-depleting crops such as cotton.

I do not want you to think I have to go south of the Mason and Dixon's line. The next one I will take will be wheat.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I cannot yield. I want to speak on some of the facts of life here and I want to be sure you get them all.

Sure, wheat is a great product in America but it is only one-tenth of the agriculture of America, and we had a set-up whereby one congressional district obtained $17,000,000 for either raising or not raising wheat, whichever it was, out in Kansas—$17,000,000 in 1 year.

That is more than what went to 35 individual States of this Union in that particular year. One congressional district of Iowa obtained $13,000,000. One district in Texas obtained $12,000,000 for either growing or not growing wheat.

Then, what do they do? They put an embargo on wheat. You cannot bring wheat into this country. Then they want to use section 32 funds to pay export subsidies and they used in connection with grains $180,000,000. Does that make sense? You can see why when they put in the so-called parity program, out of the first $212,000,000 under the guise of parity $50,000,000 of that went to the great State of Texas. I know that Texas is a great State, but I do not think it means one-fourth of America, or surely not one-fourth of American agriculture. After all, when all is said and done what is really behind this fight about these section 32 funds? They want to continue to give a blank check, if you please, to the Secretary of Agriculture, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] said yesterday, who has control of these section 32 funds so that he can pass them out any way he wants to.

I might say to you, you can talk about the balmy days of the New Deal, but so far as Wisconsin is concerned in 1939, and Wisconsin is the sixth agricultural State in this Nation, we had more farm foreclosures by the Federal land bank in 1939 than ever before in the history of America.

Special privilege to special agricultural interests has been the order of the day altogether too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired. The pro forma amendments are withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For personal services in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this act referred to as the Secretary, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this act referred to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That, of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further,* That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 2, line 16, strike out "$2,050,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to call attention to the fact that a total of $550,000,000 will be available to the REA on July 1 for expenditure and allocation. Of course, $325,000,000, the amount now on hand, while it has not been expended, has been allocated. Certainly I feel that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is entirely too much alarmed, when the subcommittee has given the REA everything it can possibly expend in the way it should be expended, without waste and with prudence.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intent, by the amendments which I shall offer today, to cripple or handicap any of the agencies or bureaus making up the Department of Agriculture. I shall present factual data only in support of the amendments which I shall offer, and leave it to the good judgment of the House as to whether or not the committee has been too lenient in its treatment of certain offices and bureaus in the Department.

Might I quote from a letter issued by the American Farm Bureau Federation as of May 24:

The Federation specifically recommends an over-all reduction of 20 percent in the expenditures for salaries, travel and other administrative expenditures of the Department of Agriculture. * * * A study of the bill and the committee report indicate that most of the reductions in appropriation have been in farm program expenditures, and most of the cuts in personnel and administrative expenses are in connection with reduction in farm programs. * * * Only token cuts were made in the personnel and administrative expenses of such agencies as the Secretary's office, where a cut of only $100,000 was made below the 1948 budget of $2,237,560, leaving a net increase of $18,350 above 1947 expenses. Likewise, the committee was quite generous with the Department's legal staff, reducing the solicitor's office only $100,000 below the budget, and only $54,000 below the 1947 appropriations, which aggregate $2,615,000. The Department is given nearly $5,000,000 for legal staff and for the Secretary's staff, or about one-third as much as the committee plans to give the entire triple A to serve 3,000,000 farmers in 3,000 counties.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is absolutely essential, as stated in my supplementary views in connection with the report, that certain amendments to this bill should be adopted so as to secure a balance between the cuts that have been made on the farmers of the Nation in their programs and those which should be made in personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture.

Please keep in mind that this great rambling structure known as the Department of Agriculture has today approximately 80,000 employees, and that number does not include the triple A, county committeemen, and township committeemen, who work on a per diem basis and who individually average a very small earning.

Let us see how the appropriations for the immediate office of the Secretary have been steadily growing. In 1938 that office received $452,700; 1939, $581,920; 1940, $618,210; 1941, $578,014; 1942, $613,970; 1943, $796,850; 1944—and here comes the first big jump—$1,648,184; 1945, $1,700,000; 1946, $1,654,000; and that was raised in 1947 to $2,048,500.

How are we going to stop the growth of this bureaucracy unless we start to put the pruning knife to it right now? Are we going to let these unproductive limbs on top of this apple tree keep shooting up into the air indefinitely or are we going to prune those shoots down to where they will produce the fruit we want produced for the farmers of America?

The Department is requesting in this bill $2,150,000. The committee has allowed $2,050,000, which, as the Farm Bureau very aptly states, is nothing but a token cut.

Mr. Chairman, I do not, personally, want to hamper in any way the work of this great Department which means so much to myself as a farmer, but I do feel that we could at least take 12 percent off of what the committee has allowed and reduce the $2,050,000 to $1,800,000.

We have cut the Secretary of Labor's office in this House by 20 percent below what he had available in 1947. I like to be fair with all of the departments. If the office of the Secretary of Labor can stand a reduction of 20 percent why cannot the Department of Agriculture in the immediate office of the Secretary of Agriculture stand at least a 12-percent cut? Is that asking too much?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the Secretary's office is decidedly top-heavy in the Division of Personnel. In the budget chart we find the Director of Personnel, grade 15; two assistants, Division of Personnel, grade 14; two assistants to the Division of Personnel, grade 13, with seven other assistants doing various kinds of personnel work in the same grade—13. Remember, this is in the immediate office. There is also an administrative officer at grade 13, and three other heads, including an assistant to the Director of Personnel at grade 13, and under these, various chiefs of divisions doing personnel work in grade 12. In addition to this top-heavy setup, we also find a special assistant to the Director of Personnel in the same grade—12.

Now, besides all of this which obtains in the Secretary's office, we find in each of the bureaus and agencies in the Department proper that there is also a personnel office. Yet in the Secretary's immediate office alone $609,632 is asked for in the name of "Personnel activities."

I have not had the time to make a similar study of the Budget and Finance, nor of the Office of Plant Operations, which also stem from the Secretary's office. The policy-making branch of the Secretary's office requires, according to the estimate, $479,000 as requested in the budget, and General operations $473,244.

I do feel, ladies and gentlemen of this House, that $1,800,000 should be ample for the staffing of the Secretary's immediate office, and I am also convinced that the cause of Agriculture will suffer in no way whatsoever through the adoption of this amendment, which will save the taxpayers of the Nation $250,000. This year we are setting the pattern for peacetime operations of these various bureaus. Might I again call to the attention of the House that we have seen fit, in the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill to cut more than the percentage requested here from the immediate office of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I leave it to the good judgment of the Members of the House of Representatives as to whether or not this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wanted the gentleman to be sure to distinguish between the directory down here in this tabernacle of the Department of Agriculture and triple A committeemen out in the courthouses of the country which comprise a grass-roots organization for which I think additional money should be appropriated. I believe the gentleman intends to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am trying to squeeze a little water out of the bureaus here in Washington so we can make sure our triple A committee system, so necessary for our support price program, is preserved. I will offer my amendment to aid the AAA committees when that portion of the bill is reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that every man, woman, and child in the world, including this country, stands only 8 inches from starvation. This is one of the truest statements, in my opinion, that has ever been made. We know, of course, what is meant by that, that the 8 inches which stand between us and starvation are the precious 8 inches of topsoil from which we all get our food and sustenance. We see what has happened to China down through the thousands of years because they did not adopt a sound conservation program. The valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates were once the most productive in the world. Today they are desolate and barren. We adopted in this country a few years ago a certain sound conservation program. All you have to do today in my

State of Oklahoma is to check that work during the past few years to see what has happened to know that it is, and has been, a sound program.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that food occupies a very prominent place in world affairs. We appreciate it is our No. 1 problem. If the raising of food for our people and the people of the world is our No. 1 problem then soil conservation surely should rank as our No. 2 problem. When you find such men as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, opposing the drastic cuts in this bill, it is something we should take into consideration. When men like the gentleman from Kansas rise above partisanship, that should be noted, because this problem should be considered above partisanship. It is something that our urban population and the people who reside in our large cities are just as much interested in as the benefits that may accrue to our farmers.

I will now talk a little about partisan politics. I hope that the Republican House leadership and that Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, will give just a little thought to this. If we pass this bill as proposed here today and return Oklahoma to its Dust Bowl era, on the basis of the petitions I have received from my home county numbering several thousands in the last 2 days, you are going to take Oklahoma out of the doubtful column or out of the border-State classification next year. Let Mr. Reece study that over. He sent his orators down there last year to tell our farmers in Oklahoma that they were being regimented, that they had to go to a triple A office and sign two or three pieces of paper, that the farmers of this country should not be treated that way. He did make some impression on them at that time. But when this bill goes out of here with soil conservation and the related programs drastically cut they will feel differently. Those people were there before this conservation program went into effect, when our land was washing away, creating barren gullies all over the State, and they can see now that the land has become more productive, which causes our farmers not only to be more prosperous but causes us to have more food with which to feed the urban population of this country. When this Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture met the other day, when the gentlemen who brought out this bill sat down around the table, the American farmer was prosperous, never more prosperous in his life. When you pass this bill today as it is presently written, he is going to be poorer than he has ever been. Unless you want to go back to 1930 and 1931 when cotton was selling for 3 cents a pound, and that is where you are heading with this bill, you had better restore these funds which are so vitally needed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the gentleman refers to the subcommittee he should refer to some members of that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. Some of the members of the subcommittee. In the name of sanity, it behooves all of us, when we vote on these amendments today, to take all of these things into consideration when they so vitally affect every segment of our economy. These cuts are not economy. They are the wildest sort of extravagance. They are madness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to the members of the committee that I trust anything I might have said yesterday in the course of our discussion on the rule did not offend the finer sensibilities of any Member. You readily understand in an atmosphere of tension, sometimes earnestness, a kind of overzealousness develops remarks that in cold print often do not look so good. So if there was anything untoward or unseemly in what I might have said yesterday, I apologize to the House. I try always to be restrained in that respect.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We accept the gentleman's apology.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I will say in all honesty and in all candor that no one in this House commands greater respect for honesty and fair play than the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am indeed grateful to the gentleman from Texas.

With respect to the pending amendment it leaves me with some difficulty, I am frank to say. It is the responsibility of the committee and the chairman to be thoroughly candid and forthright with the House, and I would be less than candid if I did not say that we did discuss a possible further cut in the administrative expenditures in the Secretary's office. I tried to err on the side of generosity. The Secretary was once a very distinguished Member of this body; in fact, for 10 years. The Secretary once served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and we count him not only as a good public servant, but as a friend.

My theory about it is this: There are times, you know, when there is not a lot of noise from the foundry and the factory, and no evidence that the whole factory is working, but that the front office is busy. I visit a huge plant in my district in off times. I do not hear those accustomed noises, but I know that 20,000 people are working in the plant. Maybe orders are rather slow and maybe 4,000 or 5,000 are laid off for a while, and maybe at times, though, their office is busier than at other times. If this bill is sustained and we terminate some of the functions, it does not necessarily mean that the work of the Secretary's office is accordingly diminished. As a matter of fact, he is asking for additional representatives in the field of food and agricultural organizations and in the field of export at the present time. So the committee did not want to be niggardly and we permitted him what money we thought was necessary for the efficient and proper conduct of his office. After all, he is the directing head, and you cannot put yourself in the position of denying him the necessary analysts, the necessary statisticians, the necessary research people, and the necessary economists to do that great work, even though some of the functions of the Department may have been curtailed. So that is the whole story and I give it to you in all candor for your own disposition.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We found what we thought were clear cases of duplication, did we not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed.

Mr. HORAN. And we asked the Secretary to make a correction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. And that is one reason given in the subcommittee for cutting the Secretary's office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there was a disposition to cut further, and there was a disposition not to cut at all, and we compromised in this bill. So the chairman finds himself in some difficulty in urging vigorous opposition to the amendment. I would much simply prefer to state the facts and then let the committee work its will on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 34, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including in addition to the objects for which funds are available for such act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration, planning, and coordination of research under section 10 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the act, as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the act of August 14, 1946, $3,000,000, of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," without matching requirement;

For research on utilization and associated problems pursuant to section 10 (a) of said act, $1,000,000;

For cooperative research other than research on utilization of agricultural commodities and the products thereof, pursuant to section 10 (b) of said act $1,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (title II of the act of August 14, 1946), $1,000,000;

In all, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That such sums as may be necessary for penalty mail as required by the act of June 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation therefor: *Provided further,* That for necessary printing and binding there may be transferred to, and made a part of, the item "Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture," such sums as are necessary: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made availabl to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments applying to various paragraphs under "Research and Marketing Act of 1946" on page 4 and page 5. Time would be saved by considering them all together. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments all be considered as one amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman intends that the section on "Research and marketing" be considered as completely read, down to the bottom of page 5?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON:

On page 4, line 25, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

On page 5, line 3, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500,000."

On page 5, line 9, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000,000."

On page 5, line 10, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,500,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in the latter days of the last Congress a notable bill was enacted under rather extraordinary circumstances. It was unusual in that, being reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, it was fathered by two men, from opposite sides of the aisle, one the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who probably has had longer service than anybody else on that great committee, who is perhaps better informed on agricultural matters than any other one man in the House, and who unquestionably, if by any misfortune we should ever have a Republican President, would be the Secretary of Agriculture.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] was joined in the sponsorship of that bill by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], who likewise had long service on the committee and at the time was serving as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. We had here the rather extraordinary situation of two great leaders on both sides of the table, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], advocating, in response, to widespread national sentiment, the establishment of this research program in the Department of Agriculture.

As the report of the committee before us today states, in reference to another provision of the bill, the accent today not only in agriculture but in industry is on research. Research has added tremendously to our national wealth. The development of plastics, rayon, synthetics, and innumerable other products is the outgrowth of research, and scientific study. It has paid rich dividends and has added to our national wealth and to the comfort and health of every family in the Nation.

We face a serious postwar problem. I do not have to tell you there is ahead of us, notwithstanding the temporary alleviation brought about by the exportation of vast quantities of agricultural products to Europe, an indigestible surplus of farm commodities for which we must find a market. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the fact that we are at this time feeding Europe as well as America we would today have unmarketable surpluses of many agricultural products on our hands right now.

One method of meeting this surplus is to develop new processes and new uses for farm products. This bill by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is the answer and was practically unanimously passed in both House and Senate.

Now in response to a budget estimate asking for $19,000,000 to put the program into effect, the committee recommends that we give them only $6,000,000 which was wholly inadequate to even start the plan.

Mr. Chairman, research requires time. We must get started early. We must act while the problem is ahead of us rather than wait until it is upon us. So in this amendment we are asking for a very modest increase—not the $19,000,000 budget estimate—but the amount required for the first year, a total of $9,500,000.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that we can have the support of both sides of the aisle on this amendment, in view of the fact that the original bill was sponsored from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is not overwhelming—it is not too great to consider, but the principle involved in the issue is very great.

Last year the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was then a member, brought this bill to the floor—a bill which created the agency for which money is now being asked. The committee was very definite in its statement as to what it wanted with reference to the conditions which had existed in previous years. I read from pages 5 and 6 of the committee report. I quote:

> Testimony introduced at the hearings shows that the activity which the Department has developed to improve the marketing system has been shifted about through a long series of departmental reorganizations and at present the Marketing Research Service and regulatory activities are spread among various bureaus and agencies and departments of the Government.

Without reading the balance of the page or the top of the next page, I state that what the legislative committee said it wanted was a marketing or merchandising research agency that could be identified, the expenditures of which could be determined and separated from the expenditures in production research, and which could be separated from production research.

The bill and report showed what was intended to be set up. The first year was designated as 1947. The first year $9,500,000 should be asked; the next year $19,000,000; and so on up successively until $61,000,000 had been appropriated. This is in reality the first year. I have said publicly, and yesterday I said on this floor, that $19,000,000 would be cheap for what the legislative committee wanted. It would be very expensive for what the Congress is getting from the initial organization in the Department.

I would like to read from the hearings. There are questions by myself and others. The chairman then says this:

> Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Phillips, just to gather it up in one package, the burden of your argument is that this is a proposal to supplement research already in the Department of Agriculture, instead of consolidating and coordinating that research in one place?

I have here, but do not have time to show you, the Secretary's chart of the proposed organization. The point I am making is that this is not set up on the same level as research in production, but on a lower level, somewhat connected with it, but not as we intended to set it up. For that reason the subcommittee decided that $6,000,000 was adequate this year, and we would very willingly listen to requests for larger appropriations in the future if the organization is set up on the same level as production research, and identifiable.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I well remember the gentleman's great interest in the bill, when it was considered in the Committee on Agriculture. It is a fact that the legislation which we enacted contemplated not only the use of existing Federal facilities, but it also contemplated the use of State facilities and, likewise, the facilities of private corporations of the country?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. The purpose of the legislation was not to concentrate research within the Department of Agriculture, but rather to spread it throughout the Nation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. And to cooperate with all State departments of agriculture?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct; and for that reason the subcommittee designated that of the $6,000,000 in the bill, $3,000,000 should be appropriated for the State services which the gentleman speaks about and a million each for three other items, one of which was also a coordinated service.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that this is a very inconsequential amount of money to provide for such an important undertaking?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the amount of money is inconsequential. I think the principle involved is very great, because we are so late in the matter of marketing research that if we do not get it properly started now, we are that much later every month and every year.

Mr. COOLEY. Private corporations are spending much more money than we are in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Approximately $30,000,000 is being spent by the Department of Agriculture now in research. The Department heads were not adamant when they came before our subcommittee. They did not answer our questions clearly as to which of the items included in the $30,000,000 applied to this principle we are discussing now, and we felt it was unsafe, when the Department itself was not sure of its ground, to jump, full grown, out of diapers into long pants in this matter. There may be things that should be explored first. That was the reason for the committee's action. I would suggest that on page 141 of the hearings you will find a table of the amounts and activities in research now being done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say that this legislation did not originate in the Department of Agriculture. It originated in the House Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] was a very distinguished member. It has the support of every commissioner or secretary of agriculture in this country. We are faced with no greater problem than the poblem with which we are dealing at this moment. I do not think we should cripple it by providing inadequate funds. I would like to mention one other thing—that it is a new undertaking and they have been in operation only a few months.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They have not actually been in operation at all, but they are setting up the organization. I would agree with everything the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] says. What he says adds up to me to the fact that we should have the kind of agency we want before we appropriate the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this series of pending amendments close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is on the pending amendment and amendments thereto?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. This limitation is only on the pending amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. WHITTEN. I must object, unless the gentleman is willing to amend his request so as to reserve 10 minutes to the committee, 5 to be used on this side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as has already been said, was enacted unanimously by this House last year after a unanimous report from the Committee on Agriculture. My recollection is that it passed unanimously in the Senate.

The legislation itself was the contribution of many different individuals and organizations. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] had introduced a bill previously which was incorporated in this bill. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] had introduced a bill, I had introduced a bill, the farm organizations had various suggestions, and all of this legislation was merged into the bill known as the Research and Marketing Act which I believe everyone who has made any study of the matter agrees is a significant contribution to agricultural progress.

It is significant and it is important because of the fact that we are now in a new era as far as agriculture is concerned. During the war we increased our production over 30 percent, and we did that in spite of all the handicaps that confronted farmers during that time in the way of shortages of labor and machinery, fertilizer, and transportation. Now that we are getting out of the war period and farmers are again able to secure normal supplies and equipment, it is certainly not to be thought that our production is going to be any less; rather, the tendency is going to be to increase, and we have adopted a policy in this country as far as agriculture is concerned that we want a policy of abundant production.

In order to carry out a policy of abundant production we must have research, not only research in production—we have had that for many years and we have accomplished wonders through that type of research—but research in utilization and research in marketing, because it is in utilization and marketing that we are going to find how to consume these surpluses of agricultural commodities that we are going to have as soon as the present abnormal world demand for food is supplied; and that time is probably not very far in the future.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly correct in his stand on this matter, in my opinion. However, if opposition to this amendment is based on the ground that this is merely adding to the research funds of the Department, why cannot provision be made that it be used for the set-up provided for in the bill last year and contemplated at that time? I certainly want both—more research and carrying out the measure passed last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will yield, the point raised by the gentleman from Arizona is the whole point in issue. The gentleman from Kansas is arguing the merits of the Research Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be yielded to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. To the gentleman from Kansas may I say that I had not asked my question and that is whether he will not discuss the matter of getting the kind of committee the House wanted in the bill it passed setting up this marketing organization.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman that there are some differences of opinion between the committee and the Department of Agriculture as to just how research in marketing should be conducted. That is only one phase, of course, of this legislation—research in marketing—but I believe the gentleman from California will agree with me that some considerable progress has been made toward getting together on that matter. At this time I do not believe it is the wise thing to cut down an appropriation; make it less than we ought to, merely because there is not complete agreement

as to how the project shall be carried out. If we fail to provide enough money and the program does not make the progress it should, then the fault is on us, but if we make sufficient appropriations and the program is not successful, then, certainly, we have done our part.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman speaks of cutting down the appropriation. This is the first appropriation we have made.

Mr. HOPE. When I say "cutting down" I mean cutting down from the authorization contained in the bill for the first year. As a matter of fact, this nine and a half million dollars is cutting the budget estimate in half for this year because the budget estimate was $19,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word to my Republican colleagues on this matter. I do not happen to have with me a copy of the Republican platform of 1944, but if you will observe that platform, you will find that agricultural provisions of that platform emphasized research; that the Republican Party platform on agriculture for 1944 looked along the lines of abundant production and research to utilize that production.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My information, both from the Department and from large cooperative organizations especially interested in this bill, is that the Department is nowhere ready to operate and that the funds we have given are plenty to carry them along. Why should we add anything if we want efficiency? The trouble with the Agriculture Department is we have been giving them money in a loose sort of way and we have no efficiency. It has not done the farmers the good it would have if the Department had acted in an intelligent way and if they were made to operate on that basis.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman that the Department is not able to use the $19,000,000 at this time, but I do believe that the Department can make use of the nine and a half million dollars and that is what we ought to put in the bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the very distinguished gentleman who has just addressed the House. He is one of the co-authors of the bill for which we are about to provide the necessary funds. I heard him recently over the radio discuss very ably the research and marketing program. I compliment him and his colleagues on our committee for standing up for agriculture. Yesterday every Republican Member of the House Committee on Agriculture opposed adoption of the very brutal rule which was forced on the House at that time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. There were five Republican members of that committee who did not vote against that rule and I was one of them.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very sorry to hear that because yesterday morning when the committee met every Republican there went on record in opposition to the rule and it was my understanding that we authorized the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] our distinguished chairman, to so announce it to the House and he did announce it to the House. If the gentleman did not vote that way yesterday, I am very sorry indeed.

Mr. CLEVENGER. No; I did not, and no other person on this earth can pledge my vote at any time on any subject.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman himself pledged it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I did not.

Mr. COOLEY. And told the chairman to announce it to the House.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I did not.

Mr. COOLEY. I apologize very profoundly. It is interesting to see very distinguished Members like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] stand up here and lecture the gentleman and the rest of the Republicans in this House for failure to keep faith with the Republican platform pledge.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I was a member of the national committee of the Republican Party that wrote the Republican platform.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the gentleman will stand by the Republican platform.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have already said I think this $6,000,000 is sufficient.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Have we reached the point where $6,000,000 is such a measly sum we cannot start a new program with that amount of money?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman——

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I asked if $6,000,000 is such a trivial sum that we cannot even start a new program?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, I do not think we can start the program with $6,000,000 when it embraces the entire Nation; and invokes one of the greatest problems facing the Nation today.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I hear so much about what the Republicans are doing. It sounds a good deal to me like you fellows always talk about economy, but you have never voted that way in your lives, and it is about time you do something like that or we are going to be wrecked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to endorse the attitude taken by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on the pending amendment.

Then I wish to add one word here in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] when he said awhile ago that we would have $550,000,000 for rural electrification by the 1st of July. As a matter of fact, $340,000,000 are already allocated and, besides, he added to that $225,000,000, when the indications are that we will have $270,000,000 more in applications. Now, these applications are coming in at the rate of $30,000,000 a month, so in my opinion you are going to have to have far more than the amount even recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to meet the demands in every State of this Union.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is the gentleman questioning my statement relative to that?

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman was in error.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I quote Mr. Wickard before the committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand Mr. Wickard did not explain that this money had been earmarked. I know, because I discussed the matter with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I read this testimony?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman can in his own time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman does not care to be answered, in other words.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, go ahead.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Wickard states, "This leaves about $325,000,000 unadvanced," speaking of the amount authorized before this time.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, but the applications are already in. That $325,000,000 has all been allocated.

Now we are getting to the point where we can get the materials. We do not have to wait for copper. The average rural-electrification line now is made of aluminum with a steel core. The only trouble with REA is that they have the applications in or the allocations made, but they have not been able to get the materials up to now. Now materials are being made available, and I say we should provide every dollar that they can use. If they do not use it, it will not cost the Government a dollar. If it is used, it will add greatly to the wealth of the Nation, and will be repaid with interest.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, they might not

use it, but it is awful dangerous to have it in their hands, because it is tempting to them.

Mr. RANKIN. It is "tempting" the farmer to do something for himself.

Mr. RICH. I am talking about these bureaucrats we have down here. You know that they are not responsible, and the less you give them the better they are off.

Mr. RANKIN. Listen, there never was an organization on earth that did more for any class of people, since I have been living, than REA has done for the farmers of this Nation in the last 10 years. And, they are very careful. Oh, I know this fellow, Levins, who got into trouble down there has been passing the word around trying to discredit the REA. He told them he was going to get even with them when he lost his job.

Mr. RICH. I am not shielding anybody.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that. What I am trying to do is to get electricity to every farmhouse in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I make no charge at all impugning the motives of anyone. I think the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle are earnestly and sincerely trying to do the right thing, and I know it is a big task. I realize the task that you gentlemen who are specifically charged with that duty by reason of your committee assignment, have in trying to reduce appropriations. I appreciate that, and I honor you for your courage when you honestly come out and take the gaff, as it were, in an effort to actually minimize expenditures, but I differ with you in your judgment, not in your sincerity of purpose, as to this bill. I will admit that you may be right. It may be that you are. But I call your attention to this significant fact: Nations become big-headed just as individuals do. I am afraid we are inclined to become big-headed, as a nation, and to think that we can do or fail to do anything we want to and still make progress; but we cannot.

I am sort of like Will Rogers, but I claim to be like that illustrious American in one respect only, that is, about all I know is what I read in the papers. According to the metropolitan press Russia, that we talk about so much, has produced by its experimentation and scientific investigation cotton that grows out in the fields with natural coloring of about all the colors of the rainbow. They also have produced a wheat that grows like alfalfa and does not need to be planted every year. They are making great strides in the field of agriculture. We need every dime that has been requested by this amendment to go forward with the great agricultural program of this Nation. I believe we will do an unwise thing by cutting it down. We are living in a day when we have begun to realize that we scarcely have scratched the surface of what we may accomplish in the agricultural field. Do you not know that out on the western plains, where I live, we sometimes produce 40 to 50 bushels of wheat to the acre on our best land; but the metropolitan press has also published the fact that in the Ukraine in Russia they sometimes produce 100 bushels of wheat to the acre. So let us wake up in this country of ours. You talk about building a bulwark against communism. The best way in the world for us to build that bulwark is to make America strong, and we can make it stronger, in my judgment, by building a strong foundation in the agricultural field than in any other possible way. So let us not make these purposes big cuts in these important agricultural items.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a party issue that is being considered at this time, this is an issue that is of vital import to the entire Nation. As has been stated, last year the Hope-Flannagan bill passed the Congress unanimously. It provided for research in the field of agriculture, utilization of products, and marketing. The bill provided that in the first year, which should have been this year 1947, $9,500,000 was authorized for those programs, and in the second year, the year 1948, the year for which this appropriation is made, it should be $19,000,000. Appropriation was not made for the first year, so next year will be the first year of operation. This amendment provides that the sum shall be increased from $6,000,000, as carried in the bill, to $9,500,000 for research in the utilization of farm products and their marketing.

Certainly there could be no stronger argument for this bill than the conditions we faced a few years ago and until the war caused us to be able to handle the surplus products we had built up in this country. Millions of dollars have been spent from section 32 funds, millions of dollars have been spent through Commodity Credit Corporation operations to handle the surplus products of agriculture we have had in this country. The item in this bill for which this appropriation is requested provides for research in finding uses for those products so that in the future we will have a smaller and smaller surplus in those fields. I say you will be penny-wise and pound-foolish if you fail to make a proper appropriation for research in the use of those products which we know in the next few years are going to be surplus.

My friend and colleague on this committee from California states that his objection to this amendment is to the fact that a separate entity has not been set up in the Department, one that you can easily recognize. Why, the chief complaint against the Department is that there are duplications, and many times in the past when the Congress has wanted something done it has set up a different agency and a different group to do the work. The duplications that are complained of are brought about just because of the attitude some folks have like my good friend from California, that every time you do something new you have to set up a different entity, something that you can recognize. I say that it ought to be coordinated and it ought to fit into other research by the Department.

We have had wonderful success in the field of research in production. We have seen hybrid corn and improved strains of wheat and cottonseed development. We have seen the rapid advances of research in production. But now that we can produce in the next few years more than we will be able to use, thus having surpluses, I say to you it is very short-sighted if we fail to make this appropriation for research utilization of products and their marketing because every surplus bushel of wheat and every surplus bale of cotton for which you find use so as to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from having to buy it and so that you will not have to use section 32 funds to export it, will mean saving many times the money that you will be spending under this amendment which, after all, appropriates only half the money that was approved by the Bureau of the Budget in this case.

May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], who is on his feet, if he can justify setting up separate entities and separate divisions for every phase of agricultural research? That is adding to the duplication—the very thing that he says he complains of.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would not attempt to justify that because I am opposed to it. This bill calls for the consolidation of it. The gentleman, I am sure, would want to correct his remarks. He said I oppose coordination. I am very much in favor of coordination. What I am opposed to is absorption.

Mr. WHITTEN. With reference to this matter of the Soil Conservation Service and the AAA payments being duplications, I requested the gentleman in the committee that he vote with me to eliminate such duplication. My recollection is that he voted against it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, again it is worth calling the attention of the House to the fact that the appropriations made for the Rural Electrification Administration are, in reality, loans and not grants. These loans are made by the Government of the United States to local cooperative electric companies, who pledge their assets and earning capacity for the repayment of the money with interest. The period for the amortization of these loans was increased in 1944 from 25 to 35 years.

I am glad to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are at present no loans in the State of Iowa which are not in current condition, with all interest and principal payments kept up. I repeat, there are no arrearages in the State of Iowa by the cooperative corporations which borrowed the money from the Rural Electrification Administration.

The farmers of Iowa have borrowed in excess of $40,000,000 from the REA. Most of it was borrowed for the construction of lines, and only a very small percentage for financing the wiring and in-

stallation of other conveniences on the farmsteads. It thus appears that in our State of Iowa, which has been one of the large beneficiaries of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Government has not lost and will not lose one single penny of the money that it has advanced. Surely, here is a use of Government funds, beneficial and yet not extravagant.

It is undoubtedly true that there is no greater modern convenience for the farmer than a steady supply of electricity. Approximately one-half of the electricity used on the farms throughout the United States is used in the household, and the other half in productive activities outside the household. The labor-saving effect of productive electricity is outstanding. Not only does the electrification of farm homes bring about great improvement from the standpoint of comfort and satisfaction in rural life; it also brings about great economic productive value to the farmer. It raises the standards of living and the well-being of agriculture generally. If electricity is useful in the city home, it is doubly useful on the farm.

One of the critical needs in the State of Iowa is the expansion of generating capacity. The fact is that there is literally no additional generating power from which additional electric power can be procured. In my own district of 15 agricultural counties in the heart of the Corn Belt, there is 1 project where 212 farms have been wired for over a year but which cannot be connected with a high line because of the shortage of power. I sincerely hope that this House will see fit to make a proper appropriation for this work of such vital importance.

Again, let me emphasize that this is not a dollar hand-out to anyone, but money advanced by the Federal Government which will be repaid by the borrowers with interest. It has led, and will continue to lead, to an improvement of living conditions in rural America. It will make farm life more comfortable and attractive. It will help continue the vast production of foodstuffs, which were so vital a factor in winning the war, and have so important a place in regaining a stable peacetime economy and an ordered world. The elemental need of the starving world is food. Our farm people of the United States are glad to have so essential a part in helping care for that elemental need.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, first let us understand clearly what is before the committee.

The budget estimate for research in marketing is $19,000,000. The committee allowed $6,000,000 and earmarked it for four different lines of activity. The series of amendments now on the desk of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] propose that $6,000,000 be raised to $9,500,000.

I trust the Committee will vote the amendments down.

I was very much interested when my friend from Oklahoma indicated that while the committee showed zeal and courage, sometimes it was with mistaken judgment. The best the committee can do is always to be guided by the testimony and make out the best case it can.

The story is about this: In the first place, the Department said they expected to run this up to $61,000,000 by 1951. With a program of that size the committee has to exercise the utmost caution. So we took a very good look to make sure that when the program begins the foundation is good and that it is launched in the right direction so that there will be a really efficient effort in the field of research.

It ought to be noted at the outset that this does not displace research in the Department. This is in addition to all other research. There is $59,000,000 worth of research in this Department and we have not disturbed it. We have not cut, for instance, research by the commodity branches in Production and Marketing Administration. That whole line of endeavor will go on just the same. But here we were confronted with an estimate calling for 1,830 people. That means trained people. That means people skilled in research and marketing. Where are they going to get them?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. The figure which the gentleman mentions had to do with the $19,000,000 figure, as was said by my friend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right; I am talking about the whole program.

But, here, with over 1,830 people they are building from the ground up. There are advisory committees which have only recently been established. So they are going to have to rob other bureaus of their scientific talent. Then, where will they get scientific talent to rebuild those bureaus? We have not put the ax on research. We have left the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Dairy Industry and that sort of thing pretty well intact.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does not the gentleman think they would have a much better chance to get their personnel if they had the money than if they did not have the money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. You cannot create a scientist. A former director of personnel for the Department of Agriculture told me in my office recently that they hired 10 people in the scientific field and could only get one genuine scientist. I said, "What did you do with the other nine?" He said, "We kept them." But getting scientific talent is a hard chore. Where are they going to find them? We went into this thing completely, because every member of the committee is interested in research, so we canvassed the situation. This is the most that in our judgment they can expend. The committee shares the view of the gentleman from Kansas. I conferred with him on many occasions and the committee conferred with him because we wanted to be sure that the action we were taking would in no way cripple the research activity. Insofar as the testimony indicates—and we labored this item probably more than any other item in the bill—in our humble judgment, after reviewing the whole business, this is as large an amount as they can efficently expend. So I sincerely hope that no more money will be made available than can be efficiently expended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. In view of all the vagueness on the part of the Department themselves, we had the conviction that it would be far safer to start out at the proper size than to start out with an aggrandized program?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the best testimony on that point is that in the original estimate they asked for half a million dollars for travel. What in the world would they do with half a million dollars for travel, for scientific personnel, when the bureau has not even been set up? They are working around now on an exploratory basis to get it set up.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yiedl?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that we have $39,000,000 for research in all things in this bill now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All of that. So I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not Reorganization Plan No. 1 provide for the consolidation or transfer of all research in the Department of Agriculture, to the Secretary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We hope in good time it will all be consolidated, but this is enough for this purpose.

I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 83, noes 63.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the chairman appointed Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 109.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: On page 5, line 22, after the words *"Provided further,"* strike out "That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the bill because I firmly believe a great injustice has been done the fishery industry of this country by a proviso in the bill that seemingly exempts any benefits

that they may receive from the Department of Agriculture in the field of research and marketing. The Department of Agriculture has already been doing much work over a period of years in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

In 1946 through Public Law 733 an advisory committee was established for the purpose of doing what they could in the field of research and marketing to develop means by which they could dispose of food, and this means not only agricultural products but also fishery products. The fish and shellfish provisions were included in that act, and purposely so in order that the work between the two departments of the Government could be coordinated and some real benefits flow to the fishery industries of this country. Down through these many months ever since the law was adopted much has been done by coordinating the efforts of the Department of Agriculture and the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior. In the field of research in transportation, marketing, packaging, and in the educational program of the country, where they could coordinate the problems of the fisheries in these respects with agriculture many benefits have come to the fisheries of the country.

The fisheries are losing the sum of $175,000 that they previously received as a result of distribution of the customs fees by the Department of Agriculture in their research studies. Those funds are cut out under the provisions of this bill, the latter part of the bill where those funds are rescinded under title II. As this bill now stands there is not a thing the Department of Agriculture can do to assist the fishery industries of the country as they have over a long period of time.

It was only recently that through the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act the commercial fisheries section of the Fish and Wildlife Service suffered a tremendous reduction. The House fortunately reinserted $150,000 so that they could continue the work as had heretofore been done in respect to assistance to the fisheries of this country. We must keep in mind that other nations of the world are considering fishery organizations as a major business and have set up major departments in their governments to deal with their problems. By clipping the funds that we have heretofore depended upon to help and assist the fisheries industry in the Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service, and now through the Department of Agriculture, we are dealing a hard blow to one of the great industries of the country that is today struggling for its very existence, particularly on account of the rapid increase of imports coming from foreign sources deluging the markets of our country, and harassing our own industry to the point that many of them are facing bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that this amendment strikes out this provision in the bill that provides that no part of the research fund whatever shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof. Give the fisheries a chance to get a little of the money, a mere pittance, as we might call it, of whatever fund may be available in the Department of Agriculture, that may be used for the study of transportation questions, packaging questions, marketing questions, education in our schools, all of which is carried on by the Department of Agriculture in respect to agricultural products but which at the same time could embrace fish and shellfish products as part of the food problem of the country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massaschusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What justification has been brought forth for this limitation which has been placed in the bill, which will have the effect that the gentleman has stated?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have not heard any up to the moment but perhaps the committee will explain the reason why this insertion is deliberately placed in this bill to exclude altogether any contribution or any assistance that the fishery industry of this country may get by the close cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Agriculture in the study of problems relating to both industries.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did not the raising of the amount from $6,000,000 to $9,500,000 lend color and strength to the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes, because it makes more money available. But what we are asking by striking out this provision in the bill is to permit the Department of Agriculture, if they think it is wise, at the same time they are carrying out the research program in respect to agricultural products, to embrace fishery products. It will not cost a great deal of money, but it does give the Department of Agriculture an opportunity to be of some assistance to the fisheries industry. Agricultural products are food and so are fisheries products and should be considered together in the field of research.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, certainly we could not expect the Department of Agriculture to undertake the research unless it deemed it necessary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not have any commercial fisheries in my district, but it is an important industry on the eastern coast of North Carolina, and I am very much in favor of the gentleman's amendment to strike out that limitation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the total expenditures made by the Federal Government for agriculture and also for fisheries is entirely disproportionate; let me say that it costs the taxpayers about $5.83 a ton for every ton of farm products produced in this country, but at the same time it only costs the taxpayers about 82 cents a ton for fish and sea-food products. It seems to me, from the standpoint of fairness, that we ought to have available in the Department of Agriculture some money that can be allocated for the purpose of joint studies of all food products, including fish and sea food, in a research program which is going on, particularly in the field of transportation, in the field of packaging, and in our school educational program. We should give some consideration to the great fishery industry of this country, the value of which at the present time is approximately $5,000,000,000.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the committee in its wisdom will accept this amendment which will permit the Department of Agriculture to assist, under the conditions that I have stated, the fishery industry, when they are carrying on the research program, and not to exclude them altogether as you do under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I join completely in support of the amendment offered by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. It is rather difficult for me to understand why the Committee on Appropriations put in the bill the proviso stating that "no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof." It was only last year that we included fish and shell fish in the Research and Marketing Act. Last year we permitted research in connection with fish and shell fish to be carried on in accordance with any appropriations made. By the provisions of this bill, if enacted into law, none of the appropriations can be used for that purpose.

The language of this paragraph is specifically directed at excluding the fishing industry, commercial fishing, from getting any of the benefits of whatever appropriation may ultimately be made. We do not ask that a specific amount be appropriated. We leave it, within the amount finally appropriated, to the discretion of the Department of Agriculture. I assume the Department of Agriculture in a matter of this kind consults with the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of the Interior.

We must bear in mind that the fishing industry is the oldest in the Western Hemisphere. We also must bear in mind that it is a billion-dollar industry, and

that it extends all over our country. It is not confined to the Northeast, it is all along the Atlantic coast, the Gulf, the Great Lakes, and the western coast, and it extends far out into the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Following the insertion of fish and shellfish into the Research and Marketing Act of last year, the Department of Agriculture, in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, appointed an advisory committee of 11 persons to carry out the intent of Congress. It is my understanding that there was appropriated a small amount in connection with this activity. At the most, the amount allocated out of the funds appropriated would be a small amount. It is difficult for me, and I speak frankly, to understand why the subcommittee specifically excluded fish and shellfish from any consideration, so far as research and marketing is concerned.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Coming from Missouri, I am about as far away from both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Great Lakes and the Gulf as any State in the Union. I have no fisheries in my district. However, fishing is a great thriving industry in this country. I can see no reason for excluding this specific industry. It made an enormous contribution to the Nation during the terrible war years, as the gentleman well knows, and it needs protection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his contribution. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. I was interested in trying to ascertain just why the committee would take this action excluding fish and shellfish. Has the gentleman been able to find out the reason therefor? Is it because a comparatively small section of the country is affected?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know of any reason. I hope that it is an oversight on the part of the committee. Those things happen, and if that is the case they ought to frankly admit it and accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is quite acceptable to me. Of course, the other members of the committee may speak for themselves, but it is entitled to fair consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the statement of my friend from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Like my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I do not live near the coast, but I am confident this is an equitable amendment and should be adopted.

I am happy to have been among those who voted just a few moments ago to restore the desired and essential appropriations to carry out the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, as described by the capable gentleman who preceded me.

I would like to point out in my few comments the serious marketing problem which confronts the tobacco growers of our country and what this Research and Marketing Act of 1946 promises not only to the tobacco growers but other farm products, in view of alarming surpluses which now loom on the horizon.

Shocking news to the tobacco farmers of North Carolina and every tobacco area of our land came from London within recent days. Members of Congress, Agriculture and State Department experts, tobacco manufacturers, not to mention the tobacco smokers of Britain, were stunned when the British Government announced a 50-percent increase in excise taxes on tobacco.

Last year Great Britain sent $220,000,000 to the United States to purchase American tobacco. Worried British officials insist that this continued program cannot continue in view of Britain's serious financial crisis, and in order to stop the flow of dollars from England, the English smoker must pay dearly for his favorite American brand.

Figures released by the Chancelor of the Exchequer of England indicate that the smokers of England are smoking one-third more than before the war. British smokers are consuming over 250,000,000 pounds a year. Of this amount, 80 percent comes from the United States.

British leaders point out that the whole total of goods sold to the United States just about equals the English consumption of American tobacco. Chancelor Dalton of the Exchequer said this was fantastic and must be stopped.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman in all that he says with respect to the tobacco situation, but I regret very much that I was not on the floor when the time was limited with respect to the so-called Bates amendment which is now pending.

Had I been present I would have asked for time myself because as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House I recall that during the war days the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee had the Department of Agriculture before it with respect to this very item, and it will be recalled by all of us who were here during that time that the fishing industry of this country gave great strength to the war effort in the increased production of fish for its food value and other uses during the war years. The greatest effort was put forth in the Department of Agriculture to increase the taking of fish both on the Atlantic coast and Pacific coast which was greatly increased not only by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior but by the Department of Agriculture as well under this very provision.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The facts are that at the same time these studies and researches have been going on by the Department of Agriculture, they have acted jointly with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and this bill prevents them from so doing by this amendment.

Mr. BONNER. It is a terrible mistake for the House not to adopt the Bates amendment.

Mr. DEANE. Now, may I proceed with reference to this serious tax situation recommended, and which I am sure Great Britain will soon put into effect?

The American Government recognizes that Great Britain faces a financial crisis, and these stern measures they are adopting should be a sobering influence upon us Americans. Yet, this new British policy will seriously influence our own 1947 tobacco market.

How, you ask?

Follow me closely. In 1946 the United Kingdom bought 364,000,000 pounds of American tobacco, paying approximately $215,000,000. On these 364,000,000 pounds the British Government levied an import duty of $7.15 per pound. Under the new British tax policy for 1947, they would levy an import duty of $11.04. This means that the British smoker will not pay 47 cents but 67 cents per package. In view of the fact that the average hourly wage in Great Britain is 40 cents, it is simply logical that less tobacco will be used.

The power to tax in this case is the power to destroy a large volume of American exports of tobacco. Our own Government experts predict that British tobacco purchases from America will be cut one-third, or 121,000,000 pounds.

Last year the American farmer grew 1,350,000,000 pounds of tobacco. Forty-five percent, or over 600,000,000 pounds, were sold abroad. Of this 45 percent, two-thirds went to England.

This year our tobacco crop is expected to yield 1,250,000,000 pounds. If Britain follows through with her tax policy, as she is certain to do, she will buy approximately 240,000,000, a drop of 125,000,000 pounds.

It is generally conceded that with Canada, Mexico, and other countries growing their own tobacco, we lose our best customer in Great Britain and, thus, we can expect lower tobacco prices. These remarks are not broadcast to alarm you but to be prepared to expect a sudden drop.

Our tobacco farmers have this satisfaction, that while there is a lack of purchasing power abroad, the United States Government will guarantee the tobacco farmers for two more years a price of 90 percent of parity.

The question arises how long can our Government continue this program. It is conceivable that the United States Department of Agriculture will be left with many millions of pounds of tobacco on hand at the end of this year in order to guarantee parity.

The Congress should support this new Marketing and Research Act with every means at its command. Let me point out also the tremendous challenge and responsibility which rests with the Department of Agriculture in carrying out

the provisions of the act. It is imperative that the best brains of the country be brought into play in furthering this new program. A new frontier with enormous markets for the products of the American farmer appears to be opening. There is not any time to lose in the job to be done and let us accomplish the task while time remains.

Finally, let me urge the growers of tobacco, that in order to hold up their prices for the 1947 season, grow the very best tobacco. In my opinion the words you will hear ringing through the tobacco warehouse during the approaching season will be quality and not quantity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(Mr. DEANE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my respect of and affection for the fishing industry and the work that I do as a Member of Congress in defense of the fishing industry. Only this morning I spent 15 minutes before the Senate Appropriations Committee, appropriating for the Department of the Interior. I spoke in behalf of the full budget amount for the commercial fisheries item in the pending Interior bill. I spoke in behalf of the Market News Service which is conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior. I spoke in behalf of the item of $175,000 that I believe has been indirectly appropriated out of section 32 funds and transferred from the Agriculture Department to the Department of the Interior.

We are not today appropriating for the Department of the Interior. We are appropriating for the Department of Agriculture. If we are going to have any semblance of order in our budgetary approach to implementing the offices in the departments of this Government of ours, we must recognize that we do have departments, each with its Cabinet head. If we are going to appropriate money in one department and have it diffused out through all the other departments of Government, under one expedient excuse after another, we will never be able to provide properly for the different departments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a fact that ought to be emphasized. This money was transferred to the Department of the Interior and we could not make a direct appropriation in this bill for the Department of the Interior. That is the essential thing involved.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All this amendment does is to permit the Department of Agriculture, as it has done for years past, to coordinate their activities with the Fish and Wildlife Service in the field of research, in the field of transportation, in the field of education, in the field of packaging, and by this amendment you strip them of any authority, even to coordinate their activities.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. I think we will have to draw lines and hold to them.

A former Secretary of the Interior noticed this mistake that had been made by the Seventy-ninth Congress, and in a column written by this gentleman on April 1, he ended his column with these words:

> The Eightieth Congress has a chance to rectify this error. The Congress must appropriate funds if it is to implement this scaly scheme designed to take fish and shellfish surveys away from the Fish and Wildlife Service and place them in Agriculture. Moreover, it would be saving the taxpayers' money and preventing duplication even if it would be disturbing a lobbyist's dream.

I want to call your attention to the Budget that was presented and available to every Member of Congress. If you will turn to page 563 of the budget for fiscal 1948, you will find outlined there the legislative foundation for this appropriation in the Interior appropriation bill. It belongs in the Department of the Interior, and all those who would preserve and protect what I think is one of the United States best industries, had best see that it is protected as a Department of the Interior appropriation.

Now I yield.

Mr. HAND. Was the gentleman referring to a report made by former Secretary Ickes?

Mr. HORAN. He happens to have been the commentator.

Mr. HAND. Does not the gentleman believe that this order he is seeking should be restored by the legislative committee and not by a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HORAN. Not in this case, because we, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, have no right to appropriate for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. COLMER. With reference to the statement of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that here you are merely transferring funds to the Interior Department, is that technically correct? Are you transferring them or are you cutting them out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The situation, may I say to the gentleman, is that heretofore $175,000 of section 32 funds in the Department were transferred to the Department of the Interior. Those funds were taken out, and in consequence this was merely a covering amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 48, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,425,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $1,597,000: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefore in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 6, line 5, strike out "$2,425,000 and insert "$2,025,000."

SOLICITOR'S OFFICE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being offered in view of the fact that the programs of the Department of Agriculture are being curtailed considerably in the bill which is before the House. As a direct consequence, the work of the Solicitor's Office, especially in relation to the farm-tenancy loans, subsistence loans, and various matters in connection with crop insurance and the AAA program, has been very much lessened and surely an organization which is already today top-heavy can be shaved down to a certain extent without doing harm to anybody in America, least of all the farmers in America.

It is my opinion that we should be consistent with respect to cuts in the appropriations for the various agencies in the Department of Agriculture, insofar as reasonably possible. I do not mean that all agencies should receive the same cut percentagewise, but the fact remains that the effects of cutting one organization severely and leaving others alone will undoubtedly result in bad feelings throughout the Department.

When we consider the entire bill as a whole—programs, personnel, and such have been cut to the extent of 30 percent—it would seem that it is not out of line whatsoever to request that the Solicitor's Office, already top-heavy, should take at least a 20-percent cut below what they have had available this past year. This is especially in view of the fact that its work as detailed in this bill will be considerably lessened.

The committee has seen fit to reduce the $2,525,000 requested for this office by only $100,000. Might I at this point again call attention to the statement put

out by the American Farm Bureau Federation in which they term this cut as a token cut only. Please keep in mind that the American Farm Bureau Federation does feel that 20 percent of the personnel throughout the Department of Agriculture could be well eliminated without injury to agriculture.

I do want to call attention to this one fact, and that is, the lawyers in the Office of the Solicitor and the Solicitor himself, together with the nonprofessional people assigned thereto, make up what is called a service organization. They do not produce. They do not do the research, diffuse the useful knowledge, gather the market news, take action necessary to provide the support and loans for commodities, or perform other services which the Department renders to the public and to the farmers. The Solicitor's Office renders legal services, and legal services only, to the administrative or operating people of the Department. Is it not reasonable that cuts in appropriations which reduce personnel and activities of the administrative and operating people, the clients in this instance, should be matched by a comparable reduction in the appropriation for the service agency?

The bill as it now comes before you provides for a mere 4-percent cut in the cost of legal services in the Department. As I stated I do not profess to be able to calculate accurately the effect of the proposed cuts throughout the Department upon the Solicitor's Office and consequently am not inclined to urge a percentage-wise cut of 32 percent in this office. On the other hand, as I also indicated a moment ago, I am convinced that the application of a little common sense will result in the conclusion that this legal service organization should be cut more than 4 percent when the clients are being cut more than 30 percent. May I call to the attention of the House the last sentence in the section of this report in connection with this item which reads as follows:

> The committee is of the opinion that an overhauling of the organizational set-up in the Solicitor's Office whereby more legal talent can be devoted to actual legal work rather than supervision could effectuate additional economy in this office.

Please also note that the Solicitor in his statement before the committee predicated his request for more than two and one-half million dollars to a great extent upon work anticipated incident to the Farm Home Administration.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am a lawyer and a farmer. I am wondering. For the life of me I cannot conceive of any material or beneficial aid that a solicitor or a lawyer would render to the farmers of this country. If it is wet he cannot make it dry. If it is dry he cannot bring rain, he cannot impel an invasion of grasshoppers or crickets. It seems to me it is a soft job for a lawyer who probably could not make a living if we put him out on his own.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that back in 1938 only $195,000 were appropriated for this particular Solicitor's Office. In 1942 $232,000. Of course, up along in 1944 we did give them the REA and other jobs to take care of, but we see at the same time that they have jumped up to $1,679,000 in 1944. Last year they had $2,214,000. They are asking this year for $2,525,000. Where is this bureaucratic tree going to stop growing? I am trying to prune this tree before it gets too high. You know, the branches on top never do any good as far as producing fruit is concerned. Let us try to instill a little economy into the Solicitor's Office, as well as endeavor to relieve the load upon the taxpayers of the Nation. Four hundred thousand dollars is a reasonable cut; 20 percent is a reasonable cut. They can stand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Are we going to get down to common sense and really try to effect a little economy or are we not?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact in this bill the Department is asking for 223 solicitors or lawyers?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They are asking for too many, I will say to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is very modest in the amendment he has introduced.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have given the farm programs, that the Solicitor's Office is supposed to take care of, a 30-percent cut in the bill in order to effect economy so that we can balance our budget. Why can we not cut this legal personnel by at least 20 percent? I think that is only reasonable.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact also that any time the Department of Agriculture wants to get some legal service, they can go to the Department of Justice?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Why, certainly, in many instances.

Mr. JENSEN. They are at their disposal every minute. I had hoped the gentleman was going to offer an amendment to strike out at least twice as much as he has.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am trying to be reasonable. I am a farmer, and I certainly do not want to do anything to hurt our great Department of Agriculture, but I do want to see to it since this Congress has seen fit to take away 30 percent of the program of the farmers, that we take at least 20 percent of the personnel out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if you would be so kind as to give me your undivided attention for just a few moments.

I do not think there is a Member of the House who knows anything of my voting record but what he will agree that I have consistently voted for economy. I know there are many members on both sides of the aisle who will agree with that statement. I have been very conservative and endeavored to so be on every vote that I have cast, whether it be a money matter or one regarding the social problems of the people of this country or of the world.

But I want to call the attention of the Republicans—and I shall not give you a lecture because I am not capable of doing that—to the fact that I have heard many of you make speech after speech criticizing those of us in the minority, who last year were in the majority, for throwing dollar after dollar after dollar across the pond to the people of Europe and never doing anything for our own. That particularly applies to the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], as well as many others.

Since you have lectured we Democrats so often on spending our substance on the people of foreign lands, I want to check the record for a moment to determine where our dollars are being spent and who has been doing the spending.

I hold in my hand the front page of the Times-Herald of Washington of May 22, 1947, which is the second best Republican newspaper in the country, second only to the Chicago Tribune, if that be any credit to its journalism, and on the front page of that paper I see a headline as follows:

> The House votes $350,000,000 foreign relief for Europe by a vote of 288 to 86.

Those 86 dissenting votes, my friends, do not equal but about one-third of the Republican membership of this House and they by no means were all Republican votes, and, lo and behold, after we have been lectured time and again by our Republican friends to do something for our own people, for instance the American farmer, the farmer of the bread basket of this country, and of the cotton South and of the far West, this same newspaper in another column announced that you Republicans have brought out an agricultural appropriation bill cutting $400,000,000 off of the American farmer. Wherein is your consistency? How much did you save? You saved $50,000,000 on those 2 days, if this bill passes as is, which it is not going to do, and you made the farmers of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, New York, and the rest of this coun-

try pay the whole European relief bill, plus a $50,000,000 tip.

Now let us see who voted for that $350,000,000 relief bill. Your privilege to vote as you choose I do not question. The sincerity of your lectures to we Democrats I do. Let us take the Republican membership of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, which recommends these drastic cuts and we will take them alphabetically. For that $350,000,000 which we so gently and graciously on April 30, threw across the water to Europe—and this was not a Democratic controlled Congress doing the "chunking"—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] voted "aye." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] voted "aye." The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] voted "aye." The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], who is not willing to give $3,500,000 additional to a farm-research program, as he told you a moment ago, voted "aye." The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] voted "aye." And, lo and behold, the Republican majority leader who is now facing me, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] voted "aye," and so did the Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and so did the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Now, who is doing the "chunking?" Who is forgetting the people at home?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Just as soon as I finish I will yield.

On the 9th day of May we had before us another bill to chunk some more money across the water, $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. Let us take the personnel of this subcommittee and see how they voted on that day, and see how they were going to take care of all this economy they were going to settle upon the hard-working farmers of this country. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] voted "aye." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was paired "aye." The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] voted "aye." The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] voted "aye." And the gentleman from California, be it one time said to his credit, consistent with his argument here today, voted "no." The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] voted "aye." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] voted "aye," and the distinguished Republican majority leader voted "aye."

Then on the 22d day of May, when the conference report on the $350,000,000 appropriation bill came back to the House, and we had another roll call on the bill, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN again voted "aye," Mr. DIRKSEN voted "aye," Mr. HORAN voted "aye." Mr. PHILLIPS of California voted "aye," Mr. PLUMLEY voted "aye," Mr. TABER voted "aye," Mr. ARENDS voted "aye," and Mr. HALLECK voted "aye." Have you ever heard of such rubber stamping? Aye, aye, aye, aye for everyone. And on this same day you bring in an appropriation bill to kick the slats out of the American farmer to the tune of $400,000,000.

Those are the men who would deny 49,000 veterans of this country a loan through the farm-tenant-purchase program to start a home and a family; who would deny research for agriculture; who would refuse to pay in full committed AAA payments; who would deny electricity to our farm people, all in the name of economy. Well why did not you think of that when you were giving so much to Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, we are seeking to expedite this bill. I regret extremely that I must object.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, I know it hurts and am sorry you cannot stand more of it. If this is the kind of economy we are going to have, Mr. Chairman, I do not want any of it. You Republicans are committing political hara-kiri. I wish I could sympathize with you but I cannot.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,887,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will at the proper time offer an amendment to restore the $25,000,000 taken away from the tenant-purchase program. The appropriation for the Farmers Home Administration, an agency of the Government which was created just last year.

It took over the functions of the Farm Security Administration, which was in disrepute, and also the functions of the Emergency Crop and Seed Loan offices. After the Farm Security had gotten into disrepute, the Administrator resigned and a former Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Frank Hancock, was appointed Administrator. When he resigned, after making a very fine record, Mr. Dillard Lasseter, of the State of Georgia, took over, and he became the first Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

This economy-minded Republican subcommittee, after lengthy hearings, provided $25,000,000, the budget having recommended $35,000,000. After the bill was reported they went back, and instead of making a scientific cut they dug up this agency, roots and runners. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has just said, 49,000 veterans of World War II who have applications now on file and who desire to purchase farms and avail themselves of this very beneficial legislation, will be disappointed and disgusted.

Although I happen to be the author of a bill, the Farmers Home Administration bill, and although I was chairman of the subcommittee of our committee to investigate the Farm Security Administration, I know I am not the only friend of that agency in the House of Representatives. I know that the agency has many friends in the Republican Party and among the membership of this House generally. I think Mr. Lasseter has done a magnificent job. He has accomplished many economies, and has made an excellent record. Members of both parties should be willing to trust him in the further administration of this program.

It seems to me it would be almost a tragedy for the House to disappoint the 49,000 veterans who are now waiting for an opportunity to purchase a farm home and start themselves in the business of farming.

I appeal to the Democrats and likewise to the Republicans to support the Whitten amendment, when it is offered, and restore this $25,000,000. I know the Republicans of the House Committee on Agriculture were just as friendly to this agency as the Democrats. I know what the answer will be when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] comes to the well of the House. He will tell the House and the country that Mr. Lasseter has done an excellent job and that Frank Hancock likewise did a fine job as Administrator. He will tell you that the collection record is superb. I have detailed information which I will place in the RECORD but which my time will not permit me to discuss now. He will try to justify the action of this committee by saying that after his committee had given careful thought to the matter, President Truman wrote a letter to Secretary Anderson suggesting that Mr. Anderson call a Nation-wide conference, a conference of all of the officials of public and private lending agencies engaged in making loans to farmers on real property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, when that letter was received, and publicity was given to it, the idea went abroad that the President was afraid we were going into some sort of inflationary spiral in farm-land values. All of us know that if we have inflation in the rural sections of the country, certainly we have inflation in the cities of America. If we are going to deprive the farmers of America of an opportunity to buy farm homes, certainly we should repeal all veterans' legislation which is now on the books. We should do away with many of the features of the GI bill of rights, because certainly no Member would be justified in discriminating between veterans in the city and veterans in the country.

Going back to the argument which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will make—and it is easy for me to anticipate his argument, because I heard his statement before the Rules Committee, and I have read the report—a little supplemental report that they put in here—but the effect of it was to destroy abso-

lutely the tenant-purchase program. His suggestion is that he and the Republicans on his committee are trying to follow Mr. Truman and strengthen his arm as he is trying to retard and control the forces of inflation on the farm. Now, the fact is, I have here a letter from Secretary Anderson. I checked with him. He checked with the White House and the White House checked with Mr. Truman in Kansas City. I will read it to the House for your consideration:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., May 27, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: In reading the report to accompany H. R. 3601, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, we find that while $50,000,000 was available for farm tenant loans for the fiscal year 1947, and while the budget submitted an estimate of $35,000,000 for 1948, the Appropriations Committee has deleted the entire amount. This action is accompanied by a statement of the committee that the committee remains a firm friend of the farm tenant loan program and suggests that its action in eliminating the appropriation should strengthen the hand of the President in his current move to halt the excessive inflation of farm land values.

On May 16 the President directed a letter to me expressing his deep concern about the recent rise in farm real estate prices. He was careful to point out that while 24 States had real estate values which are now above the inflationary peak of 1920, there was yet time to prevent further inflation in farm real-estate prices and the overexpansion of farm debts. He suggested an early conference for consideration of the problem.

I know from my discussions with the President, both prior and subsequent to the sending of this letter to me, that by his suggestion for a conference on the farm real-estate situation, he did not desire nor intend to destroy the farm tenant purchase program. Since the report of the Appropriations Committee was issued I have rechecked this with the President and find that he is strongly opposed to a curtailment of the farm tenant program to any point lower than the figure carried in his budget. Many veterans returning from the war have been able to find farms which they can purchase at noninflated prices, sometimes from aged parents who have lived a long time on the farm and are quite ready to retire. We now have pending 83,997 applications for the purchase of farms under the farm tenant program, of which number 41,560 are from veterans.

The record of the Department shows that during the past year, using the appropriations made available a year ago, we have been able to help tenant farmers acquire land under this program at an average of only $3 per farm more than a year ago. These loans to veterans and others are made under a policy which recognizes the long-time earning value of these lands, and purchases made on that basis do not contribute to inflation, but on the contrary set a pattern for the sound transfer of farm real estate from one owner to another. We need that good example and I hope that the Congress will restore the $35,000,000 carried in the President's Budget for the purpose of making these self-liquidating loans on which the repayment record is extremely good.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
*Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. In addition to that, I know everybody in this House should be interested not only in the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States, but I venture the assertion that the House Committee on Agriculture is still quite friendly to this item and I believe that the gentleman from Illinois is likewise favorable to the tenant-purchase program. I believe he will be frank enough to tell the House that collections have been excellent under the management of Mr. Lasseter.

I do not want the House to be led astray by thinking that in cutting out this item they are strengthening the arm of the President. You have just heard a letter that came almost directly from Mr. Truman. It came to me through Clinton Anderson, a former Member of the House and a splendid Secretary of Agriculture.

I have here another letter which I will place in the RECORD at this point but which I will not take the time to read. It comes from the American Veterans Committee.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
*Washington, D. C., May 27, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COOLEY: The 1948 agricultural appropriation bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee in effect denies qualified veterans with limited capital resources the opportunity of entering the farming business. By eliminating funds for direct loans from the farm-tenancy provisions of the proposed bill, the committee has deprived veterans of the right to purchase farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, a right assured them under the GI bill of rights.

The American Veterans Committee urges the immediate restoration of the $25,000,000 appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee for this purpose.

Two out of every three veterans working in agriculture when they entered the armed forces have returned to farms. This group includes over a million veterans, many of whom desire to become farm owners. We believe that they should be given every opportunity to achieve this objective.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, makes veterans eligible for loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, further augments veterans' opportunities of becoming farm owners by giving them preference over nonveterans. This act also provides for special farm-purchase loans to disabled war veterans.

Under these authorities, the Farmers Home Administration has made over 4,300 farm-purchase loans to veterans and had on hand over 40,000 additional applications from veterans as of April 30, 1947. Over 50 percent of the farm-purchase loans made this year were to veterans.

The committee report justifies the elimination of direct farm-purchase funds on the basis that such loans are too inflationary. Without careful selection of farms this statement could become a reality. We firmly believe, however, that a minimum of $25,000,000 could safely be loaned to veterans who desire to purchase farms from relatives and others at less than current market prices, to veterans who need to develop and improve farms they already own, and veterans who are able to purchase farms in areas that have not been seriously affected by high land prices without adding to the inflationary trend. Farm-development loans particularly are anti-inflationary because such loans are used to make improvements such as drainage, land clearing, and building repair and construction, and do not involve the purchase of land.

A veteran entering the farming business needs assistance in selecting his farm and in planning his farming activities during the first few years of his new occupation—a highly specialized and competitive one. Also, as a result of his military service, he has had little opportunity to accumulate sufficient capital to make the down payment needed to qualify for a loan from other sources. In order to give veterans a fair chance to purchase farms and to obtain assistance needed to become firmly established in this business, we strongly urge that a minimum of $25,000,000 be appropriated for direct farm-purchase loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and that adequate funds be provided for effective administration of the program.

Sincerely yours,

CHAT PATERSON,
*Legislative Representative, American Veterans Committee.*

Mr. COOLEY. The American Legion is in favor of this item.

I believe that every labor organization in America and every farm organization in America is in favor of restoring this item to this bill.

I will hereafter submit for your consideration the agricultural policies of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This 1948 agricultural appropriation bill, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, proposes to eliminate direct loans from the farm-tenancy item, thereby denying qualified veterans with limited capital resources the opportunity of entering the farming business.

Two out of every three veterans working in agriculture when they entered the armed forces have returned to farms. This group includes over a million veterans, many of whom desire to become farm owners. I believe that they should be given every opportunity to achieve this objective.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, makes veterans eligible for loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, further augments veterans' opportunities of becoming farm owners by giving them preference over nonveterans. This act also provides for special farm-purchase loans to disabled war veterans.

Under these authorities the Farmers' Home Administration has made over 4,000 farm-purchase loans to veterans and had 49,235 additional applications from veterans, as of March 31, 1947.

A veteran entering the farming business usually needs assistance in selecting his farm and in planning his farming activities during the first few years of

his new occupation—a highly specialized and competitive one. Also, as a result of his military service he frequently has had little opportunity to accumulate sufficient capital and to make the necessary down payment to qualify for a loan from other sources. In order to give veterans a fair opportunity to purchase farms and to obtain assistance needed to become firmly established in this business I strongly urge that a minimum of $25,000,000 be appropriated for direct farm purchase loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and that adequate funds be provided for effective administration of the program. Failure to provide these funds will, for many veterans interested in farming, deprive them of a right assured them under the GI bill of rights.

The committee report justifies the elimination of direct farm purchase funds on the basis that such loans are too inflationary. Without careful selection of farms this statement could become a reality. I firmly believe, however, that a minimum of $25,000,000 could safely be loaned to veterans who desire to purchase farms from relatives and others at less than current market prices, to veterans who need to develop and improve farms they already own, and veterans who are able to purchase farms in areas that have not been seriously affected by high land prices without adding to the inflationary trend.

To perform the combined and increased functions heretofore performed by predecessor agencies the Farmers Home Administration will have fewer employees in 1948 than Farm Security had at the time of consolidation. The appropriations made available for the separate operations prior to the consolidation provided for 9,590 full-time employees—8,377 in Farm Security and 1,213 in the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division. Through the merger this number has been greatly reduced. All 23 regional offices of the Farm Security and Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division were abolished by May 1, 2 months prior to the date required by the act.

Requests have been made for $35,000,000 for direct loans for 1948 as compared with $50,000,000 for 1947.

Fifteen million dollars has been requested for the purpose of activating the farm mortgage insurance program.

It is intended to emphasize the farm mortgage insurance program. However, it will still be necessary to make loans from Federal appropriations as it will be necessary to take care of veterans' needs, many of whom do not have the necessary down payment to qualify under the mortgage insurance plan. Indeed the most urgent question with respect to the use of loan funds is the extent to which such loans will be available to veterans of World War II now seeking to establish themselves on family-type farms.

As of May 31, approximately 49,000 veteran applications were pending as compared with approximately 8,000 1 year ago. In order to comply with the veteran preference provision of the act nonveteran loans have been suspended in more than 16 States.

It has been necessary to channel practically all remaining funds into veteran loans during the last quarter of the year. Increase in number of veteran loans is emphasized by the fact that only 211 loans were made in the first half of 1946, whereas 1,495 were made in the first half of 1947. Approximately $28,000,000 had been obligated as of February 28, with expectation that the principal portion of the original $50,000,000 authorization would be used by June 30. Of the amount obligated to date, more than half has been made to veterans and the remainder to nonveterans. There are above 40,000 nonveteran applications pending as of this date.

The crop year 1945, which is the latest period for which complete collection returns are available, was the best year up to that date from the collection standpoint. Seven million four hundred and eighteen thousand one hundred and twenty-nine dollars would have been required in 1945 to meet payments due on the basis of equal annual installments, but borrowers actually paid $18,131,313 in 1945 which is $10,713,184 more than schedule. From the beginning of the program active variable payment borrowers had made cumulative payments of $42,667,556 as against $24,299,786 which would have been due under a fixed payment contract. Sixty-eight percent of the variable payment borrowers were ahead of schedule by an average amount of $1,021 or approximately four annual installments. Sixteen percent of the borrowers were exactly on schedule. Sixteen percent were behind schedule by an average amount of $259 or about the equivalent of one annual installment.

The effect of the proposed cut in personnel of the Farmers Home Administration can only be fully understood by taking into consideration the previous reductions made in the personnel of the Farm Security Administration, predecessor to the Farmers Home Administration, and the total job now assigned to the Farmers Home Administration by the Seventy-Ninth Congress.

In the fiscal year 1942, the Farm Security Administration had 19,045 full-time employees. The President's budget estimate for the fiscal year 1948 requested $30,000,000 with full-time employees totaling 8,219. The committee bill reduces the amount for salaries and expenses to $18,000,000 which will provide for less than 4,800 employees. In other words, without taking into consideration the employees or the functions of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration, which were transferred to Farmers Home Administration, the reductions in Farm Security Administration alone from 1942 to 1948 under the President's budget estimate would be 10,826 employees or 56.9 percent. Under the House bill the reductions since 1942 would be 14,245 employees or 74.8 percent. Taking into consideration the personnel of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division, the committee bill represents a reduction of 15,523 or 76.4 percent since 1942.

This agency was established by an act of Congress on August 14, 1946, after thorough investigation, will have on next July 1, assets to be serviced during the fiscal year 1948 totaling approximately $800,000,000 including loans outstanding to more than 1,200,000 farm families. In addition, the President's estimate provided for new loans and insured mortgages totaling $141,505,000. On the basis of the President's budget, the administrative and operating costs of this agency represent 3.3 percent of the assets to be serviced and the loans to be made in 1948.

The loans made by this agency are to the small farmers who cannot obtain suitable credit from any other source. The proposed reduction will not only lessen the opportunity for these small farmers of our Nation to succeed, but will seriously impair the Government's investment in the loans outstanding. Such reductions can only result in losses of public funds direcly attributable to insufficient personnel for collecting outstanding Farmers Home Administration accounts.

The committee seeks to force a drastic reduction in the personnel of the Farmers Home Administration, a reduction of from 8,400 to 4,250. The result will be that the Administrator will have only 2.4 percent of the total assets to be administered for administrative purposes. Certainly we have no right to expect the agency to be administered properly and managed with such limitation upon funds for administrative purposes. The result will be a very substantial loss to the Federal Government, but perhaps this is the Republican Party's idea of economy. You economy-minded Republicans are having a field day, but the country will know what you are doing to the farmers of the Nation and to the welfare of the people of this Republic. You are wrecking the farm program and you know it, but you seek to justify your action in the name of economy. You are not saving money. You are actually wasting money. You are not keeping faith with the veterans. You are breaking faith with them. By failing to provide $300,000,000 for soil conservation you are taking from the farmers of America the money you promised them. You are repudiating your own obligations to those who live on the farm. You know that you are violating all of the established rules of the House and invading the prerogatives of the legislative committee, for which you seem to have very little regard, and you are doing all of this merely because you have the votes and the power to do it. There will come a day of reckoning and each of you will have to defend your position before the farmers of your districts. The responsibility is yours, and here and now you must assume it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $628,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 13, line 4, strike out "$628,000" and insert "$428,000."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is just a little effort on my part to improve the services of one agency in the Department of Agriculture. Eleven years ago we gave this agency $180,000 a year. Ten years ago, when it was a much better agency from the standpoint of the farmer, we gave it $380,000. We had in those days men like Fred Motz, Leo Mallory, Walter Schreiber, Nick Nielsen, and Lloyd Steere, men who made names for themselves all over the world, men whose records were so accurate that they were used by the foreign governments in whose countries they served.

Today we have a sort of adjunct to the State Department furnishing us with reports that are, as I said yesterday, often more of historic value than for immediate use.

I am simply suggesting that if we had a better agency at $380,000, perhaps if we cut them back to $428,000 we will get a better one than we have now. Les Wheeler can run a good office. He has in the past and he can again. Getting less may encourage the Secretary of Agriculture to see that this does not continue to be an appendix to the State Department, but that it becomes again an office of the Department of Agriculture, standing on its own feet, giving a service useful to the farmers, and of which the farmers may be proud.

I ask for an aye vote on my amendment to reduce this amount by $200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working-capital fund, without fiscal-year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund," which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interest of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Page 23, line 12, strike out the paragraph down to and including line 5 on page 25.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, will strike out the provision in the bill relating to meat inspection. Heretofore, as everyone knows, meat inspection has been carried on by the Bureau of Animal Industry at public expense. Under this amendment a revolving fund will be set up and thereafter the packers and processors would be charged a fee for the inspection made by the Federal inspectors.

We have had meat inspection for many years. It is a health measure for the protection of the public and is compulsory as far as meat transported in interstate commerce is concerned. No one will deny the fact it has been effectively and efficiently conducted.

If this amendment is adopted it is contended that for this year something like $6,000,000 will be saved the Treasury of the United States, but no one knows how many millions of dollars we may lose if it results in ineffective inspection. No one knows what effect it may have upon the public health of the country if it impairs the effectiveness of the inspection.

It is my contention inasmuch as meat inspection was instituted for the benefit of the public and the public health it should be paid for by the public and that has always been the theory on which we have proceeded heretofore. It will be said that we have other inspection services where the industry pays the fee. I think that is well stated about the fish industry. I know it is true of the fruit and vegetable inspections that we have. But let me call attention to the fact that as far as other agricultural commodities are concerned like fruits and vegetables, inspection is a voluntary matter, it is not required, it is a service furnished by the Department of Agriculture for the benefit not of the public but of the industry in order to enable the industry to merchandize the commodity on a quality basis. It is a benefit to those who pay the inspection fees.

I do not think anyone knows what will happen if we adopt this amendment. I assume that probably some packers who are now engaged in interstate commerce on a small scale may decide that they will stay within the State in which they are doing business, and to that extent the amount of meat which goes into interstate commerce and is inspected may be cut down. In the case of the large packers they, no doubt, will have to go ahead and pay the fee, but every one of us knows that that fee will be passed on either to the consumer or passed back to the farmer; in most cases it will probably be the latter. At any rate, the public that is paying it now will continue to pay it, whether we pay for it in the form of Federal appropriations, as it should be paid, or whether it is a charge which is assessed by the packer against the public or the farmer.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. This is an extremely important problem in relation to the public health, and it is extremely important to the problem of the transport of meat in interstate commerce.

Mr. HOPE. It is.

Mr. HOLMES. Do not these facts add to the importance of the amendment that the gentleman is proposing?

Mr. HOPE. This is, of course, a very important matter from the standpoint of public health, but no one in the House, unless it is the members of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, knows anything about whether this thing will work or not. No one knows what the effect will be upon the public health. No one knows what the effect will be upon the farmer if the costs are pushed back onto him. No one knows what the effect will be upon the consumer. I hope that amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be an apple and pear grower out West. We have compulsory certification of every apple that leaves the State of Washington. The industry pays for all of that inspection. We do that, of course, naturally in defense of our own industry, because in that way we can provide and assure the consumer of our products that everything is in line with Federal-State inspection. The same thing is true of several other industries. It is true also that the industry itself is one of the chief beneficiaries of Federal-State inspection. What we are discussing here is a service to the meat industry for which, so far, the public has been paying out of general funds. I submit that that is manifestly unfair. It is not moral for an industry to have this benefit and not pay its just share.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that the fruit growers in the gentleman's area are highly organized, and is it not a fact that the gentleman is now addressing himself to a situation which exists in the Wenatchee Valley, and that

you are highly organized, and you have a great cooperative enterprise out there, and that you pay your way? But, when you are dealing with meat you are dealing with something that has to do with every township in this country, and there is no way on earth for them to organize as the apple growers are organized.

Mr. HORAN. May I answer the gentleman in this way: It is not the intention of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations to change any dot or dash in the present system of inspection. All we are dealing with is the fiscal element as to who shall pay for this service. And I might say that we have been in complete agreement in our action by those responsible in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I just want to say to the gentleman that that is not the information I have from the Department of Agriculture in regard to this work. They tell me they do not favor it.

Mr. HORAN. I do not want to belabor this point too much, because I am not closing debate on this subject. But I want to say that when we asked the gentlemen of the Department whether they could carry on this work under another arrangement, they assured us they could.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Did not Congress just a short time ago apply the same formula to the inspection of other commodities? I have fish in mind. I think there were others.

Mr. HORAN. Certainly; I understand they did.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I should like to ask this, and I do not know the answer to it. After the department with its $5,000,000 of funds makes an inspection and bills the producer or the packer for it and he does not pay it, what then? Would the department then refuse to inspect him thereafter, or what would be the answer to it, if the gentleman knows? I am serious about it.

Mr. HORAN. I can assure the gentleman from Mississippi there is no danger of a meat packer or anyone else not paying the bill. I can speak from experience on that item. If you want to ship in interstate commerce and there is a just invoice against your name or your firm, you are going to pay that bill. We are not talking about unjust invoices.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman suggested that the industry would pay the cost under the terms of this bill. The gentleman did not explain what was meant by the industry. That means it will be passed back in proportion to the meat producer in this case.

Mr. HORAN. That will be paid, as all things are paid, by the buyer on a sellers' market, or the seller on a buyers' market. That is economic law that even the very able and distinguished gentleman from Texas cannot argue me out of.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, but in the case of an industry like meat it means the producer and not the consumer, and not the processor, does it not? It means as far as meat is concerned that the producer is going to pay the bill.

Mr. HORAN. We have that same problem in the fruit industry. I do not think the present action on the part of the Congress in passing this on in an unjust way to the general public is a solution. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. How will this work regarding the small factories in the small towns and the small communities?

Mr. HORAN. Exactly as it works today, because we have not changed the system one bit.

Mr. HILL. But you will change the system. That is what worries me.

Mr. HORAN. No, we will not; we will not change it one bit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. I think it ought to be more fully discussed. It ought to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture rather than in this summary way. I object.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kansas has just said, this is an important amendment. I know that even the economy-minded Republicans of this House do not want to take any action which might jeopardize the health of the people of this country. The matter should be considered by our committee, the legislative committee, the integrity of which is now greatly imperiled if not permanently impaired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has just stated that the purpose of meat inspection is to protect the public, and that is the consumer. There would be just as much meat consumed in the United States if there was not a bit of it inspected.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. But there will probably be a good many people who will buy it in every city. Therefore, it is not for the benefit of the producer that we inspect meat, but for the benefit of all the people in the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. POAGE. This bill as now written would place the burden, which is for the benefit of all the people, upon a small group of people who produce the meat. Is that not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right.

We are dealing with steers, bulls, and hogs, and the health and welfare of the American people, and, frankly, I feel that this economy bloc has actually gone "hog wild."

We have a very distinguished Republican on our committee, the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, who, unfortunately, could not be here today. He was here yesterday and in executive session discussed the great importance of meat inspection. Dr. GILLIE, I know, is regarded most highly by you Republicans. I know he is esteemed highly by his Democratic collegues. He is a veterinarian and spent years of his life in this particular work, the inspection of meat. Were he here today, I am sure he would support the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the chairman of our committee, in presenting this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. HOPE. The amendment which I offered was offered at the request of the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE. Had he been here, he would have offered the amendment himself.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I am sure the gentleman would want to complete the record by explaining the reason for the absence of the distinguished Member from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, is attending the funeral of our beloved colleague in Indiana, which explains his absence.

If we have a distinguished veterinarian on our committee who, as Mr. HOPE says, was the author of this amendment, if we are not going to follow him, and if we are not going to follow the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, it seems to me it is unfortunate. Certainly we cannot be talking partisan politics when we are dealing with a matter that is vital to the life and welfare of the people of the Nation.

I do not question the good faith of Members when they say that the costs should be paid for by the packers, but actually we know that it will be paid by the public. The big packers will pay the bill. They will label the meat and sell the meat. But what about the little packer in the rural districts? They are going to sell the meat whether it is inspected or not, and the people will have to pay.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to impress upon you once again that this does not change the system of inspection. It merely changes the matter of payment and by whom the payment shall be made.

Mr. COOLEY. It merely changes who pays the freight?

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows full well that the rich, powerful co-ops, such as you have in the fruit area of your district in Washington, can well afford to pay the bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I do not belong to a cooperative but I am speaking in behalf of the system which I think is just.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman has done a magnificent job here in Congress for the apple growers of his district. If the meat producers of America were as closely organized and as well financed, perhaps they could pay the bill. But we are going to have hog killings in every township and bull yearlings strung up to trees throughout the country, and going to market without any inspection. Yesterday when Dr. Gillie talked to us, he painted a very horrible picture of the possibilities of this legislation. He talked about tubercular meat and meat diseases of every kind known to the animal industry. He spoke about the animals being slaughtered and sold to the consuming public. The life and certainly the health and welfare of the people of the Nation are at stake in this amendment and the public should pay for inspection from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the chairman of the subcommittee and his associates. I am willing to economize as much as they are, and probably more, when it comes to appropriations for Agriculture. But when it comes to jeopardizing the health of the American people, then I must take issue with them.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to ask the gentleman if action on this bill changes any law by which a man can be put in jail for selling diseased meat.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; because the organic law requires that all meat flowing in interstate commerce shall be inspected. But what will happen if this provision goes into operation and the appropriation is denied. You will see hundreds of new small packing plants rising within the different States, doing solely intrastate business, where they are not subject to inspection, and you will also see a great deal of bootlegging, where the meat will be transported across the lines of different States and people will not know the kind of meat they are getting.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I believe the gentleman's State is just as careful and just as particular in preserving the health of the citizens of that State as is the State of Michigan. I wish to say to the gentleman that in the State of Michigan every killing that is made at any plant in that State that is not inspected by Federal inspectors is inspected by State inspectors.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad that they have it in the State of Michigan. But when this law was originally enacted it was for the protection of the public so that all meat going into interstate commerce would come under Government inspection and people would know that they were getting good meat that was free from disease and fit for human beings to eat.

I believe the situation is a little different here than it was with pears and apples. Meat is a highly perishable commodity. The inspection must be made immediately after the animal is killed so that the insides of the animal can be examined to determine whether or not the animal was diseased. After the inside is taken out, oftentimes you are not able to discover whether that animal had any disease or not. So I say to you that this is a measure that is in the interest of the public health. If there is any laxity in the enforcement of it, then there may be a complete breakdown in the distribution of good healthy meat throughout this country.

I dislike very much to see our intrastate system of meat distribution broken down and substituted by a lot of small tree slaughterers and others, like happened in the OPA days, when a great deal of diseased meat was sold throughout this country. We owe it to the people to protect them. I am sure there are more people eating meat than are eating pears and apples in the State of Washington and other States.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman as to what percentage of the meat of the United States at the present time is under Federal inspection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not have the exact figure, but I assume it is at least 50 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will tell the gentleman. It is 70 percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. Seventy percent of the meat of the country is federally inspected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Not under Federal inspection?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I leave it to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who has said it is 70 percent. This demonstrates that a large portion of the meat sold to to the American people is federally inspected and goes out with a Federal stamp placed there by a man paid by the Federal Government so that the meat is good and wholesome and from an animal that was free from disease.

I urge support of the amendment for the benefit of the health and welfare of all consumers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in this instance going along with other members of the subcommittee. I think this is one of the pertinent places in this bill where the taxpayers' money can be saved upon the basis of a true economic approach. There has been much discussion about who war going to pay the freight if this language stays in the bill. I think anybody who is conversant with the procedure of the way costs are passed along to the consumer, knows that eventually the consumer is going to pay this cost. As far as any Member being concerned about a great consumer constituency being poisoned, I would like to suggest that the Member refer to his county and to his State legislative bodies and have enacted proper legislation for meat inspection. I do not think there is any legitimate reason to be concerned along that line.

I am opposed to the amendment and request the House to vote it down. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this discussion with a great deal of interest because I have been interested in the livestock business all my life. It so happens that I have been through the packing houses in Chicago numerous times; I have been on the killing floors and have seen the inspectors work following the beef, pork, or mutton, from the live animal down to the finished product.

When the Meat Inspection Act was first passed the whole packing industry of the United States, unjustly I think in large measure, was under very severe attack. It might be said that the original act was almost punitive in character, but it has worked out exceedingly well and the meat inspection has been exceedingly well done. Today every reputable packer wants the inspection, as well as the consumers who understand the importance of having healthy beef, mutton, or pork.

Some fear has been expressed lest if we transfer the burden of the cost from the Federal Treasury to the industry, a lot of little packing plants will spring up all over the country situated within State borders who will avoid this burden by not engaging in interstate commerce. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible that a thing like that should happen for this reason: a modern packing plant cannot be prosperous unless it engages in the production of byproducts as well as in the original slaughter of live animals, and if they engage in the production of byproducts they must be shipped in interstate commerce and that automatically brings

them within the inspection law. The day has long since gone by where the little slaughterer is contented with merely killing the steer and burying the hide, the bones and the offal and selling only the meat. That day has gone by long since.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is less than a year ago since that very thing was taking place.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And it was taking place only because of the OPA price ceiling on live animals which created an artificial condition which, thank God, no longer exists.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That took place under the black market; but you cannot have a black market in the free market, and that is what we have today. The man who is going to engage in the livestock industry, be he producer, farmer, rancher, or processor, or the final marketing outlet, wants his product well thought of by the consuming public. When a consumer goes into the butcher shop and sees on the side of a piece of mean "U. S. No. 1" that is the meat he wants; and every packer, great or small, knows that.

All we do by this proposal is to say that the industry, being one of the great beneficiaries of the inspection service, ought to carry the burden of the cost. Every other industry carries the burden of the cost of inspection. I have been in the Chicago yards time and time again and have purchased live animals to be shipped home. Some had to be inspected for tuberculosis. Who paid the cost of inspection? I did. Should I not? Whose beef was it?

That is all this amendment does. I think it is wise and consistent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the same theory that the gentleman paid for the inspection of cattle, then the consumer should pay for the inspection of the meat.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am a consumer. The consumer eventually will pay anything that is part of the cost of production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Either the consumer or the purchaser.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One or the other, yes. Between them it will be paid. You never can tell where it is scattered. That is true of all expenses. When I buy a pair of shoes in a store here in Washington I pay part of the rent of the store. I do not know to what extent that happens, but it happens in all business. There is nothing new or strange about that. It always happens.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Did the packers appear before the committee and present their opinion on this particular change?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know. I was not a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the committee now and further I hesitate to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from New York. I rise in support of the amendment. May I say to you this afternoon in these United States that the livestock industry of this country has been built up because of the quality of the products we sell to the people of our country. If we adopt the legislation as offered by the committee we are going to upset the whole meat-inspection program that we have been using for these many years. Not longer ago than day before yesterday I spoke to a member of this committee who is a veterinarian of high standing. He feels the same as I do. He feels that we better leave these regulations as they are. If we are going to change the meat-inspection law, let the bill come in as a separate bill, be referred to the proper committee, and have all the parties to the controversy given a chance to be heard. That is the very thing I objected to in connection with the rule on this bill. The rule covered a straight 100-percent piece of legislation. This is not an appropriation item at all. The consumers do pay for this inspection. We have been paying for this inspection and we are not objecting. No member of this committee has objected to paying for this meat-inspection service.

I want to ask, Where is the pressure coming from to change it? Where is it coming from to change our meat-inspection regulations. If you want a change in the meat-inspection laws, put it in a legislative bill; if there are people who wish them changed from the livestock industry, from the packing industry, from the consumers, let us have hearings where all can give their testimony.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Does the gentleman think that that very important stamp on the dressed carcass of an animal marked "U. S. Inspected" would continue to be used as widely and as thoroughly as it is being used now?

Mr. HILL. It would not mean a thing. Today it is the United States of America behind that stamp. If you adopt this amendment you will still have it. If you do not adopt it you could easily loose the real quality and general benefit of this most efficient service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, while I represent a wholly metropolitan district, where you do not find farmers, I am also interested in the welfare of the farmer. I dislike to see our farm program crippled. It has been demonstrated many times in our history that the prosperity of the people in the cities is in a large measure dependent upon the prosperity of the people on the farms. We have come to find in our economy that what hurts one group often reflects itself in consequential injury to other groups.

The people in the cities are dependent upon those on the farms for food and for the necessities of life. Those on the farms are dependent upon the cities for markets for their products.

At this time we are making great efforts to bring about price reductions. The high prices we are experiencing affect all of our citizens and most of us will agree that the burden of our existence would be much lighter if prices can be brought down to a reasonable level.

Meat is the mainstay of the family diet of the average American family. Like other commodities, the price of meat has jumped more than double during the past few months. Contained in this bill is an item for Federal meat inspection. Theoretically, the bill places the burden for the payment for inspection service upon the processors and handlers, but all of us know that this expense is ultimately going to be passed on to the consumers in the form of still higher prices for meat.

We have a rigid sanitary code, prohibiting the interstate shipment of meat that has not been Federally inspected. We have made great progress in protecting the American people by the enforcement of these regulations, and to do anything now that might weaken them, to my way of thinking, is taking a chance with the health of the American people.

It has only been a few weeks ago that we passed a bill in this House providing several million dollars for the eradication of hoof and mouth disease, not within our own country but in Mexico. Congress went far, and I believe rightly so, in this instance in safeguarding the people of our Nation against this danger. Disease in cattle is no respecter of State lines nor even the boundaries of countries.

For over 40 years, the Federal Government has borne the cost of Federal meat inspection. An outstanding record has been made. It would certainly be inconsistent for us to refuse to provide funds to continue this service.

I urge that funds adequate to continue Federal inspection of meats under present methods and standards be restored to the bill.

(Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

INSPECTION COST WILL BE PASSED ON TO FARMERS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to eliminate annual appropriations for meat inspection by providing this year a nonrecurring appropriation for a $5,000,000 revolving fund and requiring packers to pay fees to cover the cost of service.

The committee, in saying that the cost of meat inspection should be borne by the product, probably is saying in effect that the cost will be borne by the producer.

The packers operate on a margin, and obviously are not going to absorb the cost. Packers will either pass the cost on to consumers or back to producers, and necessarily so.

Consumers are already grumbling about food prices, with just cause, and some interests are capitalizing on dissatisfaction with high food prices to spearhead a drive against the entire farm program and against national efforts to hold down prices generally. It is extremely doubtful whether consumers will pay increased prices to cover the cost of inspection under present conditions, and it is certain they will not as supplies come more nearly into balance with demand.

This may well mean that the costs of meat inspection will come out of the prices and income of farmers—the people who for many years in the past have had to subsidize consumers by taking prices and income below the parity level of fairness. This meat inspection is a small item of cost, but it can be one more fixed wedge between the price paid by the consumer and the price received by the farmer.

Until there is some way of distributing the cost of meat inspection as fairly as it is now distributed through taxation, we should support the inspection service by appropriations. Certainly, we should not force the farmer, who normally gets only a little over half of the consumer's meat dollar, to pay for this consumer service.

From the standpoint of public policy, there is a clear advantage in maintaining meat inspection through public appropriations. This method helps to assure the public high-quality service. If the service is maintained by fees paid by packers, they may—even though they pass the cost back to producers—acquire a feeling of proprietary interest in the service—a vested right to control or influence the service. We should keep our meat inspectors as free from both subtle and direct pressure as our customs inspectors and internal-revenue investigators. Meat inspection is, and should be, treated as an essential public service, paid for and controlled by the public, acting through Congress.

The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] should be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On the point at issue I would like to say that when the processors begin paying the salaries of the inspectors you are not going to have free and independent Federal inspection. I have seen that happen many times in State inspection with a number of State slaughterhouses.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the conclusion of the gentleman's speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am apprehensive about any provision which will change our meat-inspection laws or practice. I know that during the recent war the safeguards of inspection were let down and that at the risk of the Nation's health we tried to make meat available to our people regardless of its sanitary controls and inspection. All of us must have regarded that as merely a temporary situation and hoped it would be very temporary. It may be that the provision as written into the bill might be satisfactory and effect some saving, but I am inclined to think that the saving is at too great a risk.

Several have spoken about the pride which the great packers take in their product, and argue that they would maintain the high quality under the proposed plan, but I am not sure in my own mind that such would be the case. I am old enough to remember some of the conditions prevailing at the turn of the century in the days when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States and before the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906. In those days notable books were written, such as The Jungle, portraying the terrible conditions in the big packing plants, and indicating what a menace to the national health those conditions presented. We are thankful that President Roosevelt read some of that literature and took an Executive interest in cleaning it up.

No doubt the menace from animal disease and unclean meat products at that time was as great a menace to the national health as adulterated drugs or any other food product which Dr. Wiley later fought to eliminate. I cannot see how it would be possible to return to such a sad state of affairs, but I want nothing done in this bill that might lead to it. Therefore, as a measure of safety, I shall oppose this attempt at saving a little money at the risk of the Nation's health.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, on the merits of the amendment, the proposal is to let the packers pay the inspection fee, which means the consumers will have to pay it. Of course, when the money is paid by the United States Treasury the consumer is paying it; so there is not too much of a saving, as I see it.

I want to direct my remarks to the distinguished chairman of the committee. This is unquestionably, as he readily will admit, legislation on an appropriation bill. Is there any disagreement about that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not too certain about that. I think that this might very conceivably be in order under the Holman rule, because while it is legislation, it provides for a reduction of expenditures on its face, and while I have sought no parliamentary ruling on it, I am not so sure that the point of order would lie.

Mr. PACE. The law expressly says now how the cost of this inspection shall be paid, you propose to change it and you are therefore changing the law. Assuming that it is legislation, which I think it is, the gentleman from Illinois stated that under the Reorganization Act the Senate committee was not even permitted to report out a bill with legislative language in it. Then when this bill reaches the Senate committee, this provision and other legislative language in the bill will be stricken out. It cannot be reported to the Senate with this language in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us clear that point. Very definitely not. The Senate has no authority to pass upon whether or not an item in a bill coming from the House is in order so far as that rule is concerned.

Mr. PACE. Using the words of the gentleman himself—and I am not trying to put new words in his mouth—he stated that under the Reorganization Act the Senate committee was not permitted to report to the Senate an appropriation bill containing legislative language. It therefore seems to me the amendment should be adopted, and this question should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, where full hearing can be held and proper legislation reported to the Congress as to the best method of handling these inspection costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, who has been in the cattle business all his life, made the case against the pending amendment to strike this out. This is not unadvised action that we take. Is there anybody in this Chamber who believes that the committee on its own responsibility would undertake this action without careful consultation with the Department of Agriculture? Now, first let me make it emphatic that the committee did not draw this language. This language, may I say to my good friend from Colorado, was drawn in the Department of Agriculture by the budget officer in consultation with the Bureau of Animal Industry and with the Department solicitor. That is where it comes from. Now, we had ample discussion with Dr. Miller and with Dr. Simms, the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the testimony both on and off the record is quite clear. I asked Dr. Miller:

> What fee do they pay, if any?
>
> Dr. MILLER. No fee.
>
> Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there any reason why they should not pay a fee?
>
> Dr. MILLER. The only reason is that there is no requirement for them to pay a fee.

Then I asked him whether or not it could be done. He said:

> Now, if, as a public policy, it is desirable to have the packing industry pay for the cost of inspection, we can administer an efficient inspection service under that plan.

There is no change. Not a single lay inspector will be changed. Not a single veterinarian will be changed. Not a single one of the 125 clerks will be changed, and there are some 2,986. All that will

happen is the same service will be rendered that they render now. At the end of a quarterly period they will render a bill to the packer for the amount of service that has been rendered, and with respect to the observation made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], there is no subsidy in it. The Federal Government still pays these salaries. This is nothing else except a so-called capital account, as it were, with a fiscal-year limitation, and it is revolving in nature, so that the fees are taken in every quarter. These people are still under the discipline and still on the pay roll of the Department of Agriculture. There is no change.

It occurs to me that before all these bland statements are made on the floor that perhaps you ought to refresh yourself a little on the record and see exactly what is before us. Now, that is the whole situation in a nutshell. In addition thereto it will save $6,140,000 this year, and we will be able to recapture an additional $5,000,000 of capital account next year, so that there will be a saving from here on out of at least $11,000,000 or more every year for the Treasury of the United States.

There is one other element that ought to be included here. Do not forget the meat that goes abroad. The countries overseas have regulations, rules, or statutes under which no meat can be exported to their countries unless it is inspected. Out of the Federal Treasury we pay for the inspection of meat that derives to the benefit and the profit of the packers of the country as it is sent into every corner of the world. Should there not be some pay for it? That is no advantage to the Federal Treasury.

In addition, they maintain 7 laboratories. They conduct chemical and pathogenical tests. They have laboratories that work in the field of meat, oils, cereals, and curing materials. There is the whole story. We do it in some respects on perishable vegetables and commodities and there is a fee. On wool standards there is a fee. On cotton fiber there is a fee. On cotton standards there is a fee. On grain standards there is a fee. So this has been carefully worked out, and it is consonant with the fee system that applies to so many agricultural commodities today. Therefore I hope that the amendment to strike out this provision which will save money and put this burden upon those who have the advantage, without impairing its efficiency or efficacy whatsoever, will be voted down.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me the gentleman is missing the point that has been raised, in my mind at least. It seems to me if the inspection is changed, of course the big packer——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The inspection is not changed.

Mr. GRANGER. This is what will happen if the people who pay the salaries change——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Federal Government pays the salaries.

Mr. GRANGER. Just a minute. What will happen? The big packer can pay the fees and he will pay the fees, and he will be very diligent in seeing that everyone else pays these fees, but what it will mean in the long run is that the little packer, who cannot have an inspection of his own without this service, will simply be wiped out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That question has not been raised with respect to $20,000,000 worth of fees that the Department of Agriculture collects. It may be that the distinguished gentleman from Utah thinks he knows more about it than do Dr. Simms or Dr. Miller, but we have some other ideas about it, and the Department of Agriculture thinks this will work out exactly as it is working out at the present time.

I suggest that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 83, noes 102.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. HOPE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 114, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $500,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended by the act of June 24, 1946 (Public Law 427), and the act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 27, after line 12, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For repair of buildings, fence, electric line, and feed bunk, recently damaged by tornado at dairy field station, Woodward, Okla., $5,300."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a committee amendment and speaks for itself. It is merely to repair damage done by a windstorm at a United States facility at Woodward, Okla.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here is a proposition unbudgeted, unsupported by the Department, and unwarranted by any precedent of the House.

We have had vastly greater national disasters. For instance, at Texas City the other day, in which the loss in life and loss in property was incomparably greater. If we start in making provision for compensatory relief for damages occasioned by every windstorm that blows, we are creating a precedent that will rise to haunt us for years to come.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I assume the gentleman knows that this is a building that belongs to the Department of Agriculture at Woodward, Okla., and these repairs are for Government buildings at Woodward, Okla. They were blown down by a tornado. If the Government does not repair them and rebuild them, who would rebuild them?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is ample provision here for repairs to all necessary damage to Government property. Of course, practically every time we have a windstorm a post office or other Government building is blown down or damaged. The proposition has not been presented to the Budget Bureau and the Department does not recommend it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment was approved by the subcommittee. Obviously, windstorms and acts of God are not going to wait particularly upon legislative processes. Here are some dairy farms that have to be put into condition for use. If you want to leave them there, according to this ingenious argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], there is a chance to save $5,300, but they are going to be facilities that cannot be used. Certainly this work ought to be done because these are Federal buildings under the direction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is exactly correct. I was amazed and astonished at the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]; he surely must not have any idea what the facts are. These were Government buildings destroyed by tornado, some completely destroyed. Now he says they are going to practice economy by not repairing or rebuilding these Government buildings. I do not quite understand that philosophy or that argument.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. It occurs to me that my very good friends are straining at a $5,000 gnat and wanting to swallow a lot of million-dollar camels.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is not objecting to this amendment simply because Woodward happens to be in my district and that I happen to belong to the Republican Party; I cannot imagine that is his reason for it. It is just hard for me to conceive the idea that he does not want to do anything about restoring

Federal buildings destroyed by an act of God.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. As I understand, this matter was considered by the committee; it was not just grabbed out of thin air.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course it was not grabbed out of thin air. It is a committee amendment, based upon an itemized statement of actual damages caused by the tornado.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly when a government project is destroyed or damaged, we should repair it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman sure he said loud enough that Woodward, Okla., was in the congressional district of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; may I say to my distinguished friend from Texas. He understood the gentleman from Oklahoma correctly. Woodward is right in the heart of the great Eighth Oklahoma Congressional District, the outstanding agricultural district in Oklahoma; in fact, one of the outstanding agricultural districts in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council, $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be available for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment that relates to the same matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 30, after line 7, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement and repair of buildings, equipment, and supplies, utilities, fences, and other general repairs and clean-up operations from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward, Okla., $45,600."

Mr. DIRKSEN. These, Mr. Chairman, are also buildings that were destroyed by the windstorm and must be replaced and repaired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And these buildings were owned by the Government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Owned by the Federal Government; yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to ask about the information relative to this damage. While this was considered in the subcommittee there was no evidence of any sort whatever and it was not presented to the whole committee. I would like to know from whence comes the information as to the extent and amount of the damage?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can tell the gentleman because this was prepared in the Department of Agriculture. A seed house costing $15,000 was completely demolished; a machinery shed costing $7,000 was completely demolished. There was a seed cleaner dust bin demolished costing $500. That results in a total of $22,500.

Then there was a machine shed, four frame dwellings, a frame pump house, office building, frame soil house, and three metal bins; also a quantity of machinery and equipment, including tractors, grass seed clipper mills, binders, cultivators, and so forth; then there was office and laboratory equipment and seed and supplies, blown away or damaged by water, then a power line was destroyed and two transformers demolished; there was also the rebuilding of fences and tree removal, where trees had blown into the area.

The total amount was $50,900.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has answered my question. He does have the figures from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the greatest of detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the investigations contemplated by the act of May 15, 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack investigations; $511,500.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 35, line 16, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and there shall be transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from Government surplus without compensation therefor, a certain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (consisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser subdivision, and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728 in the city of Pasadent, Calif.), valued at approximately $15,800."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this language appeared in the Budget but was inadvertently omitted from the committee print.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. It should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,000,000, of which at least $11,050 shall be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 41, line 21, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,555,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am not unaware of the advice that is usually given to newcomers of this House that they should keep their eyes and ears open and mouths closed for a while, and while I have been here a little over 3 weeks I feel compelled, because of my direct concern with the slash in the fund for the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., to speak up, and I do it reluctantly, because I have a great deal of respect for this subcommittee, and I am not unaware of the great respect in which the chairman of the subcommittee is held throughout my own Middle West. But, I am prompted to do that, and particularly to take issue with the statement of the subcommittee in their report on page 21 that—

The work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has never enjoyed the high esteem of the committee or of the Congress. Much of the work pursued at this laboratory is academic or visionary in character and has not, in the opinion of the committee, given practical results consonant with the vast sums which have been applied over the years.

As a result of that feeling on the part of the committee they reduced the requested appropriation, which was in accord with their appropriation last year when the pay raise is taken into consideration, to the flat sum of $1,000,000. I cannot help but feel that this slash in funds is due to a misunderstanding of the practical value of this institution in my home State and the failure to understand the work that they have accomplished and that they are now accomplishing.

First of all, I think we all should know that Mr. George Hunt, the present director who took over not more than 2 years ago at Madison, is a sincere and practically minded research director. I am not familiar with what type of directorship this institution has had in the past. But, I am familiar with and I know personally the highly qualified gentleman who is director of this institution at Madison at the present time.

I would like to also call to the attention of this Committee the statement of my colleague, the gentleman from Wash-

ington [Mr. HORAN], a member of that committee, when he pointed out to the members of this subcommittee on page 138 of the hearings, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, they are all utilizing a part of our natural resources that otherwise would go to waste.

Any of you who live in the forestry areas and have seen the tragedy that beset their lands, where the part that could be used for good timber was cut and the rest of it was permitted to be spoiled, can understand very well the language of the gentleman from Washington on page 138 of those hearings.

Mr. Trayer, Chief of the Division of Forest Products, who testified before the committee, was asked to provide a summary of some of the completed projects of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison during December 31, 1946. Mr. Trayer furnished to the committee, and they appear beginning on page 111 of the report, a list of 825 projects that have been completed by this laboratory. It was made plain that these projects are illustrative and not inclusive of all the projects that have been completed. Among them were a great number of wartime projects, such as packaging work for the Army ordnance. They reduced shipping damages in some cases up to 50 percent. In one year alone they reduced the lumber requirements by over 1,500,000,000 board feet, and instituted new packaging procedures. For the War Production Board, by establishing a pilot plant, they revolutionized the process of obtaining alcohol from waste wood products, something we needed badly in wartime and something that we got for almost nothing.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. This laboratory at Madison, Wis., serves the entire United States on all products and is not confined to any one area?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is very definitely true. They have the assistance of seven other use stations for utilizing these products throughout the country, but they serve the whole United States.

Mr. RIVERS. They have saved this Nation countless millions of dollars.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is also true.

The wartime record can be shown to have continued during peacetime, and to have existed during peacetime prior to the war.

One of the things they have done is develop a process for the production of newsprint from lumber that could not be used for that purpose before. Over on the other side of the Capitol they are investigating the newsprint situation today. Would anyone here say that in view of that shortage the project for permitting this use is something that is visionary or something that is not practical?

I cannot help but submit to this committee as a whole, in spite of my respect for the subcommittee, that these projects have been neither academic nor visionary but they have been practical, and that they have returned to the people of America a thousandfold every dollar that has been invested. I hope this committee will see fit to adopt the amendment restoring the appropriation for this worth-while Government agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone can say there was a mandate at the last election to cut the activities of this very important laboratory. This is the most important laboratory operated by the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service in the whole Nation, to my knowledge. For the 6 years I have been in Congress we have been fighting, with help from all over the Nation, to maintain this important laboratory and others at places where the research for the improvement of forestry management and the improvement generally of forest products is carried on. In our activities we found a great need for the continuation of the activities of this laboratory. The gentleman from Wisconsin has told you very ably that this is not a sectional thing but a national thing. It serves the entire Nation. It has brought returns a millionfold to the taxpayers and those who are interested in the products of the forest. Nobody can estimate the value of this thing to the entire American people.

I hope that the Committee will not seriously object to this amendment. We would be wise indeed to make it possible for this laboratory to carry on with this very distinguished director, because I am confident if more of us knew more about it many more of us would be here defending and justifying its continued expanded activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to what our able friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, have had to say about the importance of the Madison laboratory. Its work should be continued without reduction.

It may be that the people who are conducting experimental research in Madison need to have a fire built under them so that we can see more tangible results from their work. The commercial application of research and its value to the Nation's economy is its real justification. But the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, Madison is now engaged in highly important experimental work which should be carried through to completion as rapidly as possible.

At this time in our Nation's history, when reduced forestry resources threaten to become a more and more serious matter, we can ill afford to eliminate experimental work which may within a short time make it possible for us to utilize in industry many wood products not now being used.

As only one illustration, I have in mind experimentation which is going on in the utilization of scrub oak, gum, and poplar, which commercially are now considered to possess very little value.

Not only shall we find it necessary to use better methods for the maintenance and conservation of our forestry resources, but in addition we may have to depend largely upon these now virtually useless woods in the future manufacture of paper, fiber boards, and tannin. The Madison laboratory has in process important studies on these woods. During the war we used billions upon billions of feet of our finest timber. We must face the fact that our best timber is gone. Today we are cutting timber faster than we are growing it. We cannot indefinitely continue that process without getting hurt and hurt bad in this country. Our economy is too strongly dependent upon timber to neglect it.

The laboratory in Wisconsin, the largest of its kind, the one which is carrying on the most complete and comprehensive experiments on the entire subject of the utilization of forestry products, is in a position to make material contributions to the Nation, and I think it would be poor economy to limit its activity at this highly strategic period in its history.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, over the years the appropriations for the Forest Products Laboratory has received a great deal of consideration. May I say to my esteemed friend the gentleman from Wisconsin, in whose district this laboratory happens to be, that some years ago I went up to take a look for myself. I was sort of looking around at some of our agricultural installations and, frankly, I cannot disclose on this floor what I found. That does not apply to the present Director but to the previous Director. Subsequently, when we had hearings on the matter he came to Washington. He invited me to dinner. He wanted to talk to me. So I went to see him at the Metropole Club. He fairly wrung his hands and said, "What can I do? What can I do?" I said, "My friend, the best thing you can do is get on a train tonight and go back to Madison where you belong." So I took a look at some of the things going on there. I think the committee was charitable when they say so much is highly visionary and highly academic. Go through this whole list that they recite and they will give you a list as long as your arm of the things they have done. They have showed statistically that "the fiber cavities of wood do not change on swelling and shrinking for the average of many species." That is what they show. They have showed that "the relative humidity at which wood impreg-

nated with aqueous solutions starts to shrink is determined by the relative vapor pressure over the solution."

Now, is not that marvelous? Our friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] years ago used an expression when we were dealing with these regional laboratories, "We want no chemical curiosities." That is one of the things they are turning out—a lot of arithmetical, geometrical, chemical, and pathological curiosities. So they can fill this book with that sort of thing, but this committee wanted some results at the practical level. That is the reason we cut this down, because we thought it was a waste of funds.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Does not the gentleman realize that that type of information is essential in the manufacture of pulp and paper and synthetic products?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I realize that is just as necessary as knowing something about the stratosphere, but if it is not applied to some actual benefit for humankind then why maintain the laboratory? We have got enough scientists who are living in stellar realms today who find great delight in manufacturing equations of one kind or another, but the final test is, What does it amount to at the barnyard level? That is what we are interested in.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. That might be curious to you but it is not curious to somebody who knows something about growing timber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, this is very serious with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 54, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advice timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766) of the act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one who spent considerable time before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to express appreciation for the patience and uniform courtesy shown by the chairman and members of that subcommittee, during their hearings, and to commend them for the thoroughness of their deliberations.

I am extremely gratified that the committee has allowed the full amount of budget estimates in certain important items affecting forestry. I refer particularly to the appropriations for forest fire cooperation, for farm and other private forestry cooperation and for experimental forests and ranges. In the South we have very little public land and these cooperative programs of protection from fire and of technical aid to landowners are vital to progress in forest conservation. And our forests in turn are the life blood of many communities and industries.

However, other provisions in this bill which carry reduced appropriations for vital forestry services do not seem consistent with the needs for a program in keeping with the great importance of the Nation's forests. For example, the amounts provided for investigations in forest management, forest products, and forest resources carry in total, reductions amounting to $1,210,000 in comparison with the appropriations for fiscal year 1947.

New methods of turpentining trees developed under the forest-management investigations program have been of inestimable value to our naval stores industry. Further improvements are needed and any slowing down of progress now will be felt by thousands of people.

I am particularly concerned over the very heavy reductions for research in forest resources investigations. This is the item under which the widely recognized forest survey of the United States is conducted. We have had an initial survey in the South virtually completed and our industries found it of great value in planning their operations. I do not share the opinions of the committee as expressed in their report that this work is of little practical value and I am sure that many forest industries in the South share my feeling. We want to see this survey kept up to date as a basis for further planning.

Likewise, I cannot accept without comment the opinion of the committee that research in forest products as conducted at the Forest Products Laboratory is visionary. Here again there are in the South many recipients of the research results flowing from the laboratory who will not agree with the committee opinion or appropriation action. As only one important example I mention experiments on the use of scrub oak in the manufacture of paper and board and the derivation of tannin from its bark. Thousands of acres in the South are producing this now worthless tree.

Other portions of the bill concerning research in agricultural crops show no such proportional reductions. This I am glad to see, but in the southeastern United States we have more forest land than crop land. And we have a lot of forest land that ought to be back in forest land. Our forests are depleted, and their production is low compared to what it could be. Over half the southern forests are in industrial or similar ownerships, both large and small, with the remainder owned principally by farmers. There is a considerable acreage in public forests and parks. Practical technical information is the most important tool that these owners can have at hand in operating their forests, and this tool is a result of research and investigation. I am greatly disappointed that forest-research services to our people will be weakened with the passage of this bill.

I am also disturbed over other provisions in the bill as they affect forestry. Total reductions approximating $16,000,000 for the United States Forest Service cannot be taken lightly at a time when national resources have suffered several years of intensified depletion during the war. We discovered during these years what shortages of a vital resource really means. Then they were primarily due to necessary diversion of lumber and other forest products to the war effort. All home-building and other activities forming a part of peacetime progress came to a standstill. This same thing could happen in the face of shortages due to scarcity, and forest resources are ever growing scarcer. Right now we are using timber faster than we are growing it, and our best timber is gone. If we do not take aggressive action to adopt and implement a broad forestry program designed to rebuild this resource, we are asking for eventual return of public control of production, distribution, and prices such as we had during the war. These things can be avoided only when an abundance of resources are present. I want to see our economy stay free, but we must face the fact that the Federal Government must exercise leadership and pioneer in this matter of forest conservation if we are to really get on top of the job. There is considerable doubt in my mind that the Congress has ever supported forest conservation as fully as it should be supported. For these reasons I regret any retrenchment or any giving of ground in our public efforts to advance conservation in forestry. In fact, we could more properly be debating the amount of increased appropriations for this activity rather than confining our deliberations to reductions.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

FOREST DISEASES

Mr. Chairman, the committee cut $80,720 from the budget estimate of $440,000 for investigation of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods of their control. The amount allowed, $359,280, appears on line 25, page 28, and lines 1 and 2, page 29 of the bill. In the report, page 16, under the heading "Forest diseases," the committee states that the $80,720 cut was that part of the fund heretofore "allotted

for work on diseases of young natural stands and plantings (including white pine blister rust, chestnut blight, and rust of southern pines)."

Very little testimony appears in the hearings relative to the work covered by the $80,720 disallowed. Dr. Cullinan, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, of the Beltsville Experimental Station, was asked a few questions. His testimony begins on page 773 of the hearings. Evidently no one connected with the experiment station thought any of the projects were in danger, as there has never been any question about the fine work the Beltsville station has been doing in connection with the projects eliminated.

The work eliminated is essential if we intend to protect our forests which, as everyone knows, we are fast depleting. In 1909 our saw timber was 2,826,000,000,000 board feet. In 1945 the estimate was 1,601,000,000,000. This indicates that in 36 years we reduced our saw timber 44 percent. At present we are making terrific drains upon our saw timber. Last year we cut or destroyed 53,900,000,000 board feet of saw timber and against this the estimated growth of saw timber amounted to only 35,300,000,000 feet. Thus it will be seen we overdrew our saw timber account by 18,600,000,000 board feet.

Now, if we are going to stand by and see diseases ravage our forests—the chestnut blight has already killed all of our American chestnut trees—we are going to be right up against it for timber in a very short time.

I am not offering an amendment to restore the cut, because I think the proper way to proceed is for the Senate to bring in the scientists from Beltsville for examination. I am fully convinced if this is done the cut will be restored.

Our forest problem is becoming such a serious problem that we cannot afford to assume the risk of our forests being further depleted from diseases. We should do everything in our power to protect our forests.

Most of the projects that the cut eliminates are in their final stages. It would be absolute folly to discontinue the work at this time.

In the interest of preserving our future forests, it is important that the diseases which attack young trees be held in check. The Forest Service, National Park Service, Soil Conservation Service, State agencies and others depend on the Bureau for information on controlling the diseases.

In addition to devising better control methods, important progress has been made in developing hybrids of white pines resistant to white pine blister rust, of chestnuts resistant to chestnut blight, and loblolly pines resistant to fusiform rust. Further selections and testing are necessary before the varieties should be released for extensive planting. Discontinuance of the work would jeopardize the investment in these experimental plantings.

The forests of the future must develop from young trees. Diseases of young trees frequently prevent the growth of desirable timber stands and plantations. It is important to study these diseases to determine methods of controlling them, also to develop disease-resistant hybrids. The Forest Service, National Park Service, Soil Conservation Service, State agencies, and private owners, depend on the Bureau for assistance in controlling these diseases. The sudden termination of long-time research in this field not only disturbs cooperative arrangements with State experiment stations and other agencies, governmental and private, but also causes large losses resulting from discontinuing long-term investigations and breeding projects, and failure to prepare reports and publications relating to them.

The cut would eliminate 19 average annual positions and affect the work at 12 locations scattered over the entire United States. Since the work is part-time at 9 of the locations, the elimination of funds for the project will have the effect of curtailing important work on other projects. Altogether, forest disease work will have to be discontinued at 6 locations: Saucier, Miss.; Chico, Calif.; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Savannah, Ga.; Syracuse, N. Y.; and Glenn Dale, Md.

The disease investigations and research under this project which would be eliminated include:

First. White pine blister rust, including selection and propagation of pine and ribes resistent to the disease, $25,800.

Because of white pine blister rust, forest reproduction of white pines can now be attained only with costly control measures. So that future plantations of this important forest tree may be safe from the rust, several promising selections of eastern white pine resistant to the disease in initial tests have been developed by cooperative work with the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station and the forestry school at Syracuse University. Further testing is needed before these strains should be released to Government, State, and private nurseries for large-scale propagataion and distribution. On the Pacific coast, similar selections are being made of the sugar pine, and promising new hybrid pines developed by the Forest Service are being tested for rust-resistance. Assistance to other agencies is also being continued in the development of better methods for the control of blister rust.

Accidental introduction of white pine blister rust from Europe in about the year 1900 brought the gravest threat to the immensely important white pines of North America, the most important species in the United States being the eastern white pine, western white pine in the Northwest and California, and sugar pine in Oregon and California. While mature pines may be greatly damaged by the rust, the greatest destruction is to the seedlings and young trees which are girdled and killed by the disease. Forest reproduction of white pines in the presence of the rust is hopeless. The rust does not spread from pine to pine but goes from pine to currants—ribes—and from them back to pine. Discovery of this fact led to eradication of the alternate ribes hosts as a control measure.

Many of the essential facts concerning blister rust and its spread under different conditions of climate and host plants have been determined. We now need to intensify our work on the selection and propagation of resistant pines, so that future forest plantations may be safe from the rust. This work is well started. In cooperation with the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station and the forestry school of Syracuse University in New York, several promising selections of eastern white pine have been made and have withstood intensive initial tests. After further tests these strains will be released to Government, State, and private nurseries for large-scale propagation and distribution. On the Pacific coast, this kind of work is being developed for the sugar pine and we are also testing the rust resistance of promising new hybrid pines developed by the Institute of Forest Genetics, United States Forest Service, Placerville, Calif.

Horticultural varieties of currants resistant to blister rust have been selected and are being tested at our northeastern laboratory at New Haven, Conn. This would revive a horticultural industry through providing rust-immune currant varieties that would not threaten the pines.

Experimental plots in Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California are designed to improve the efficiency and lower the costs of present eradication methods. Where large amounts are being expended on control of infectious diseases, it is always justifiable to make reasonable expenditures for research to improve the control methods, especially as the disease spreads to new climatic areas and infects new alternate hosts.

All of this research would be discontinued.

Second. Chestnut diseases, including breeding, testing, and propagating blight-resistant hybrids, $28,530.

Extensive breeding and selection work has produced many disease-resistant hybrids and Asiatic strains which are being tested in forest plantings. They are also being tested for their tannin content, since a domestic source of tannin is vitally needed, especially during war when it has been a critical material. The blight-resistant chestnuts tested thus far have as high tannin content as disease-susceptible American chestnuts. Further testing is necessary before the varieties should be released for extensive plantings. Discontinuance of the work now would result in the loss of much of the investment in these experimental plantings.

The loss of the chestnut from the blight permanently reduced the productivity of millions of acres of forest land in the area east of the Mississippi River, as trees replacing the chestnut are of less value. Its multiple uses for lumber, tannin, nuts, durable posts, and poles made it invaluable for the farmers' woodlots. Extensive breeding and selection work has given us many disease-resistant hybrids and Asiatic strains now being extensively tested in forest plantings. Within a few years we expect to have sufficient data on their relative value to justify recommending certain ones to State foresters and for the public at large, for extensive forest plantings. To completely discontinue the work now when

paying results are so near would result in the loss of much of the Government's investment in these widespread experimental plantings.

Tannin is strategically vital for production of sole leather in time of war. During World Wars I and II ships had to be diverted to bring tannin from Argentina and Africa. At present blight-killed chestnuts, which will not last indefinitely, furnish over 60 percent of our domestic vegetable tannin. In case of another war some other domestic source of tannin is vitally needed. Blight-resistant chestnuts tested so far have as high tannin content as American chestnuts. In time enough of them could be grown to serve as a living tannin stock pile. In view of the critical shortage of domestic vegetable tannins, testing of blight-resistant chestnuts and working them into our forests should be accelerated, not stopped entirely.

Chestnut orchards are important in limited areas in California and scattered plantings occur in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The few chestnut blight infections so far found have been eradicated in cooperation with these States. There is a good prospect that the disease could be kept under control at a low cost in that area, even though the orchards are mostly composed of the very susceptible European chestnut. Discontinuance of our part of this cooperative work may result in the blight becoming established in the western States.

This country in normal times imports fifteen to eighteen million pounds of chestnuts from Europe, but the blight is spreading rapidly in Italy and in time this supply will be cut off. Blight-resistant chestnut trees distributed by this Bureau are producing good crops and give indications of being the basis for a large chestnut orchard industry in the eastern States. Nut decays and other troubles need further study, especially in the Gulf States, but our cooperative work with the horticulturists looks very promising for this entirely new industry.

Third. Fusiform rust, brown spot, and pitch canker of southern pines, $11,960.

Thousands of acres of forest plantations and young natural stands in the South are now being ruined by fusiform rust of loblolly and slash pines—a disease totally different from white pine blister rust—and brown spot of longleaf. The fungi that cause these diseases have been determined. Good progress is being made in controlling these diseases by various methods developed for existing young stands and by testing resistance of pine strains for future planting. Southern pines furnish fully one-third of the domestic annual lumber cut; they also have great value as sources of pulp, ties, poles, cooperage, veneer, turpentine, and rosin. Virgin stands are almost gone; the future supplies depend on reproduction and new forests. In the South, 10,000,000 acres need reforestation, largely with pines. Upwards of 20,000,000 pines are being planted anuually on southern farms. The cut in funds would eliminate all of this research and would necessitate closing our field headquarters at Harrison Experimental Forest, Saucier, Miss.

Fourth. Dwarf mistletoe and other diseases of young natural stands, $9,380.

Dwarf mistletoes rank next to heart rots as a cause of loss in western coniferous forests, where they are a major factor in decreasing growth on millions of acres and are ruinous to the young forest reproduction. The House cut will eliminate the studies on determining the most practicable and efficient methods for mistletoe control so that these methods may be made available for extensive use by timberland operators, as well as cutting out all work on other diseases of young natural stands. Cutting mistletoe out of overstory trees improves them and protects the young reproduction by removing the source of mistletoe seed. In established plots we are studying the extent and frequency of mistletoe cutting required for control, and the conditions under which affected large trees should be harvested. When labor becomes abundant much work of this character will certainly be done by the large timber interests, including the national forests, State forests, and very extensive privately owned forests. There is a large demand for the information, and we should lose no time in determining the most practicable and efficient methods for mistletoe control so that these methods may be made available for extensive use by timberland operators.

BAMBOO DISEASES, $850

A previously unknown serious root disease of timber bamboo has been discovered during the past year in north Florida. Other diseases are impairing bamboo culture in South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana. Initial studies on these diseases have been made at the request of bamboo growers. Bamboo is being increasingly planted in the South for diversified uses, one of which is for the production of paper pulp. The growing bamboo industry needs expansion of the work on destructive diseases.

I hope the Representatives interested in protecting our forests from diseases will appear before the Senate committee and urge that the cut be restored.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman name one single pest they have helped to eradicate?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly can.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would name them.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I refer the gentleman to the chestnut blight which came right down through his State and cleaned out every chestnut tree in Pennsylvania. They have developed at least six types of hybrid chestnuts at the experimental station at Beltsville which have stood up against the blight for over 20 years. They want to carry this experiment on for a few years more to determine which type is the right type with which to restock our Appalachian forests. That is going to take time.

Then I call the gentleman's attention to the pine blister rust. We have checked it. We are to the point now where we know how to eradicate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The appropriations in this bill for the Forest Service are not as large as they ought to be. From what has gone on in this House yesterday and today, it is very evident that any motion to increase the appropriations for the Forest Service would be voted down. I hope that when this bill gets over to the Senate the Members of that body who feel kindly toward the Forest Service will be able to restore at least some of the funds which have been reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House even at this late hour, when I know the Members are tired, to say a few words in support of the Forest Service. This House recently established a special committee to study the newsprint situation. There is a great shortage of newsprint in this country, and we get the most of our newsprint from foreign sources. During the war we greatly deleted our forests because of the great need for lumber. Even before the war, and for many years prior thereto, we have been very negligent about our forests. Many sawmill people cut out the timber with little or no thought of the future. In many instances seed trees were not left. Great stretches of country, especially in the longleaf pine section, have been nearly denuded of timber. It was certainly a short-sighted policy, and today we are experiencing the results of that policy. Erosion is taking place at a rapid rate. This causes accelerated water flow and it all adds up to more frequent and greater floods.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have time to further portray the results of our unwise use of the once great timber resources in this country. But the bright spot in the whole situation is that we have learned at long last that we must conserve our forests, that we must restore our soils, that we must put back as much as we can the elements and natural resources which have been destroyed over a period of 50 years or more. A good many years ago this Nation embarked upon a plan of reforestation, upon a program of reseeding our denuded lands, conserving and restoring our soils, and the restoration of our natural resources in general. We have spent considerable money in that direction, but we are going to have to spend more. We must realize that there is just so much land in this country. We must realize the absolute necessity of growing forests for our children and those of future generations. It is plain good business to do so. It is unfair for those living in this age to continue to deplete our natural resources without making adequate provision to provide something for those coming after us. I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that more ample provision be made for the growing of timber for the future welfare and prosperity of the whole country and for the further conservation and restoration of the natural resources of our country. I hope that the Appropriations Committee in the future will make better provision for these

great national needs for all the people than are made in this pending bill.

(Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the majority leader and other Republican leaders are in a desperate position. Their very utterances, as well as their actions, evidence this fact. They—the eastern-dominated Republican Party—have already ignored the just claims of the great West and Northwest by the unjustifiable slashing they gave in the Interior appropriations bill. The eastern-dominated Republican Party is now doing the same thing to the farmers and the rural areas of our country. The Republican Party leaders do not tell the country that before he sent his budget estimates up to Congress, President Truman reduced the departmental requests by about $7,000,000,000. Their only cry, as stated by the majority leader, is that "There is stubborn opposition to every effort we make to cut the cost of government." I don't understand it that way. What we are opposing is the false economy of the Republican Party.

Real economy is one thing; false economy is another. I wonder if the people of the West and Northwest consider the sharp reductions in the Interior Department appropriations, which played into the hands of the utility barons, as real economy of false economy? I wonder if they consider what has happened to be in their best interest? I also wonder whether our farmers consider the sharp reductions in this bill as constituting real economy or false economy? Do they consider the blow which has been dealt them by this bill to be to their best interest?

The false economy of the Republican Party in the Interior appropriations bill was harmful to the West and the Northwest and also to the fishing industry of the country. The false economy of this bill is harmful to the farmers of America, to the school-lunch program, and is also harmful to our fishing industry.

The only economic groups who think they will benefit by these reductions are the big business interests of our country. They are the ones who have dictated and who are applauding the Republican false economy program—despite the fact that this false economy is a powerful factor in producing the business recession that now faces the country.

The people of the country might just as well wake up to what is going on in Congress. Eastern big business controls the Republican Party, and that means Eastern domination of the Republican Party in Congress. Under the Republican Party, with this Eastern domination, the Government is giving primary consideration to dollar values, with human values forgotten. Under the Democratic Party the Government gave, and properly so, primary consideration to human values, to the best interests of our people as human beings.

No, the issue involved in these drastic reductions is not real economy. The issue we are fighting is false economy.

(Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, $500,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned about some of the drastic cuts being made in this appropriations bill which are detrimental to agriculture. My record for economy in government speaks for itself. I am also quite sure that the farmers of America want economy in government and want savings made in the proper places. This appropriations bill, however, would seem to take the props from under agriculture in many instances. No one knows what the future holds for agriculture. It is the Nation's basic industry, and we, from the Midwest at least, have learned long ago that food for our people simply does not grow on trees. Just now we are being called upon to produce food and more food, not only for our own consumption but for the entire world. The farmer should be encouraged in the splendid work he is doing to feed the starving people of all nations. If we have another depression in this country we had better be sure that we have a foundation ready for agriculture on which to build and survive.

I want to make special reference to the elimination of section 32 funds which provide agriculture with money from custom receipts with which to maintain price supports under surpluses. Section 32 on which agriculture has depended all these years is now rudely jerked from under us at the very time when agriculture is facing the greatest surplus it has ever faced. All appropriations for this fund are eliminated under the provisions of this bill and, in my judgment, such action is ill-advised.

I also want to say a word about the cut in appropriations for conservation and use payments. This program has been carried on for a number of years, much of it during the time when agriculture was in real distress. The program was again specifically authorized by the Congress last year and, as a result, contracts were entered into with our farmers in good faith and now we find that under the provisions of this bill such contracts are being invalidated to the extent that the appropriations are not sufficient to carry them out. This is simply breaking a contractual obligation.

Last year the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, sponsored the enactment of the Hope-Flannagan bill to carry on agricultural research. Appropriations for this service have also been drastically reduced in this bill. The program is still in its infancy and sufficient funds should have been provided to carry on this work to its fullest extent. If there is anything needed in agriculture today, it is research. I hope that sufficient money will be appropriated to carry on this splendid work.

I regret that I cannot agree with the Appropriations Committee on many of the items brought to our attention today. I only have time to mention a few. The Soil Conservation Service is most important. It should be carried on to the fullest extent and the Budget estimate for this service should be allowed. I realize, however, that we must pass this approuriation bill in order to carry on the necessary functions of government and only regret that this committee has seen fit to so drastically cut appropriations in so many instances. I for one want to speak out in protest on behalf of the Nation's farmers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

[Mr. SMITH of Ohio addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $38,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

KEEP SCS AS IS

Mr. Chairman, I have made quite a study of the work of the Soil Conservation Service people as they assist soil conservation districts. I have observed progress at close range. I have talked to hundreds of farmers in my congressional district, and to State agricultural leaders and county agents. I think I know a few things that all of you may not be familiar with.

Every one of the 14 counties in my congressional district is organized into a soil conservation district under Iowa State law. The Soil Conservation Service is giving technical assistance to each of these districts, and doing a magnificent job, too. The farmers need this help, and they want it continued and expanded. I know these farmers and their soil conservation problems. And I know

they, the majority of them, Republicans and Democrats alike, would be opposed to sharing the technical assistance they now receive with the new districts that are coming in. But I fear that is exactly what will happen even if we accept the full amount in the President's budget proposals. And so, with all of my congressional district organized into soil conservation districts I think I am in a position to make a few observations based on my personal experience and study.

There has been a lot of talk in the past 2 years that the Soil Conservation Service should be combined with the Extension Services of our land grant colleges, and that the latter should have charge of soil and water conservation work.

There are a lot of things wrong with this idea. I shall mention only a few of them. In the first place, the Extension Service is the educational agency for agriculture. It was set up for that purpose, and it wants to operate that way. I well remember the testimony of M. L. Wilson, director of extension work, during hearings on the 1947 Agriculture Department appropriation bill. Director Wilson, testifying on the farm labor program made it clear that the Extension Service would like to be relieved of the farm-labor program, so that all the colleges and those connected with them could all be put into the educational program. Director Wilson said that he thought all the extension directors in the States felt the same way; that too much of a load could not be put on the extension workers; that educational work was what these men were fitted for, and what they wanted to do.

H. C. Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, one of our leading land-grant colleges, said this in a speech last December in Chicago:

> If work experience means anything, I can say to you that in my opinion we have done a better job in Maryland than we would have done had the Soil Conservation Service been a part of the AAA or a part of any other unit of the Federal Department of Agriculture.

That is a direct quote from President Byrd of the University of Maryland. The Extension Service folks of the land-grant colleges, I am sure, feel the same way about it. They have got all they can do in the agricultural educational field—that is their job.

The Extension Service does have a big part to play in the soil-conservation program in their own field—that of education. In most States Extension is doing a good job in the field of conservation education which is necessary to prepare farmers for the technical help the Soil Conservation Service gives individual farmers through soil conservation districts. In fact, more educational work is needed in order to speed up the job of getting permanent conservation on the land. Dr. R. K. Bliss, who retired about a year ago as extension director at Iowa State College, made an inspiring soil-conservation talk over the radio on June 12, 1946. In this talk Dr. Bliss pointed out that soil conservation is Iowa's greatest economic problem. He said further, and I quote:

> What the program lacks is the educational and organizational drive to get everyone—farmers, schools, city people—all interested in soil conservation. This educational job falls largely on the Extension Service.

That is the way Dr. Bliss, former Iowa extension director, feels about this problem. So, you see, Extension has all it can handle in the field of conservation education. It is not equipped to deal with technical phases of an action program, nor does it want to do so.

I would like to quote once again from the Chicago speech of President Byrd. Dr. Byrd said:

> We must have a continuing, aggressive national agency devoted exclusively to the problems of land conservation. We have that now in the Soil Conservation Service. The job is too vital, too complex, and too basic ever to become a side line to another activity. We cannot permit the national job to be split into segments, or to be subordinated to a variety of other agricultural programs.

That is a direct quote from the president of the University of Maryland and I agree with him.

SCS ORGANIZATION SOUND

Now let me comment on another charge that has been made against the Soil Conservation Service which I consider to be unfair and untrue—and I think I can substantiate what I am about to say by facts from the record. The charge is that the Soil Conservation Service is a top-heavy organization, that its overhead is high. The Soil Conservation Service has one of, if not the lowest overhead of any agency in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service, more than any other agency I know about, has taken its job out on the land. It has consistently reduced its overhead year after year. I think it is an efficient agency, an economical agency. I only wish all the agencies of Government had half as good a record.

Iowa is one of the eight States in the Upper Mississippi region of the Soil Conservation Service, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis. The other seven States are Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Missouri, Wisconsin, and Illinois. In the regional office at Milwaukee, and in the eight State offices in that region, the Soil Conservation Service has a total of 291 employees, including clerical, accounting, budgeting and purchasing personnel who perform functions required by law of all Government agencies. Of the 291 employees in the regional and State offices in these eight States, the Soil Conservation Service has 95 professional grade administrators, technicians, specialists, and supervisors.

I want to make it clear that I do not consider the Soil Conservation Service, with 95 professional and 196 clerical and stenographic regional office and State office employees in the same 8 States, is wasting the taxpayers' money with a top-heavy organization. I am convinced the Soil Conservation Service is streamlined for an efficient job, that it has the bulk of its personnel—86 percent of its employees by Department and Budget Bureau overhead standards, to be exact—out in the field offices to serve the people on the land. In fact, if you consider that practically all of the professional employees in the regional and State offices contribute valuable specialized technical assistance in the field and not in an office—the real overhead—administration and facilitating service—of the Soil Conservation Service is nearer 6 percent than 14 percent.

The Soil Conservation Service operates efficiently and economically—more so than any other agency in the Department of Agriculture. It is not a top-heavy organization. In reality, about 94 percent of their employees are working directly at the job of getting a permanent conservation program established on the land. We must not hinder this all-important program which the Soil Conservation Service is carrying on so effectively to conserve the precious soil of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation or administration of any 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to marketing quotas under the latter act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses

of said office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,* That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1385)) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further,* That where farmer participation in the program in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 48, line 26, strike out "$165,614,290" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment to see if we can agree on time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and amendments to this paragraph close in 30 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we see how many Members want to talk on this?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The matter has been discussed in general debate and elsewhere and I think the membership is quite familiar with the issue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not been able to speak and I should like to address myself to this matter for at least 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The chairman of the committee has not had an opportunity either, even in general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman, that applies only to the pending amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. CANNON. And not to any further amendments?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel I must object in that there are several amendments I know will be offered and from the number of Members who want to speak this will leave approximately 1 minute each.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, suppose we agree to run on for a little while, then see if we can limit time. I withdraw the request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is only in recent years that the country has become conservation conscious. Even at that we are a little late. But we are beginning to realize belatedly that we must conserve what remains of our natural resources. Much of our wildlife is already gone and can never be replaced, and millions of acres of arable land have been so depleted and eroded that it can never be reclaimed.

So, at this late date there is a feeling throughout the country that we should conserve what resources still remain.

Our basic resource is the land. Everything goes back to the land. We must produce from the land the food and the raw materials and the fiber upon which every industry in the country is dependent. It takes 100 years to make one inch of soil, and during the war years we have ruined our soil, we have drawn upon it as never before. In response to this thought-producing situation we passed in the last Congress an authorization for a $300,000,000 program of conservation, one which met with general approval on both side of the House, and in both Houses of Congress.

Under that authorization the Department of Agriculture has announced this program, and a large percentage of the farmers of the Nation have entered into what they believe to be binding contracts with the Government, and most of them have performed what they conceive to be their part of the contract.

This program is of special interest to the small farmers. Out of the 3,404,126 farmers who have participated in the program, 2,746,951 will draw $100 or less than $100, and nearly half will draw less than $40.

It is the small man who has a stake in this program, the man who is not able to finance his own conservation unless specially encouraged. It especially applies to the rented farm.

Here is a long-time program under which we preserve the basic fertility of the soil. It has been remarkably successful. Concurrence in the committee report, eliminating entirely the 1948 program and cutting down to $150,000,000 the appropriation for the current program, means that the Government will be able to pay these farmers less than 60 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot repudiate the Government's obligations in that irresponsible manner.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hear one of my colleagues asking what the amendment is. The amendment is to increase the amount of payments on what is sometimes referred to as political conservation rather than soil conservation from $165,000,000 to $300,000,000.

I think it is significant that we have already passed the part of the bill which applies directly to the conservation of the soil. Being a farmer, I believe in the conservation of soil as only a farmer can, but I believe I have a moral obligation to myself and to my neighbors and to society in general to take care of that soil myself. No one pays me for taking a bath, but it is good for me. It is good for the farmer to take care of his soil himself.

We have passed the section dealing with Soil Conservation Service, and we approach the Production and Marketing Act, in the first paragraph of which is an amount for soil-conservation payments. We are not talking about soil now, we are talking about payments out of the Federal Treasury. All of the breast beating and the crocodile tears we are going to have today are not over conservation of the soil, they are over the political payments to those who comply.

In his budget message to us earlier this year the President of the United States said:

> A year ago the budget message recommended gradual reduction of these payments, and that recommendation is now renewed. More than 60 percent of the total payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. Most of this money, thus, is being paid to a comparatively small number of farmers, who, because of their strong position in American agriculture, would undoubtedly continue the best farm-management practices without the persuasion of a bonus from the Treasury.

I subscribe to that part of the President's message.

> We should shift our effort from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service—

The section dealing with which we have just passed without objection—

> and the Extension Service—

Which this committee did not dilute in any fiscal manner.

The President of the United States concludes:

> I therefore propose that the appropriation act limit the conservation and use program for the crop year 1948 to $200,000,000 instead of the $300,000,000 program to which we are committed for the crop year 1947. This will

not affect expenditures materially until the fiscal year 1949.

I have read from the committee report, page 6.

On all of those commitments or contracts to which the President refers there was small print which said that this was dependent upon the money being appropriated, and the commitments referred to by the President were made on that basis. I submit that in this debate upon which we are now launching we should restrict our arguments not to the conservation of the soil, which I do not think is debatable, but to the matter of political payments out of the Treasury for practices that any good farmer ought to follow. As the President himself points out, 60 percent of these payments go to one-eighth of the Nation's farmers.

The table below outlines some very interesting facts regarding AAA payments:

[Based on 1945 and 1946 program]

| Size of payment to individual payee | Number of payees | Percent of total | Payments | | Percent of payment proposed 1947 | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Amount | Percent of total | | |
| $0 to $60 | 2,150,602 | 63.17 | $55,844,000 | 22.08 | 100 | $55,844,000 |
| $60.01 to $100 | 596,349 | 17.52 | 45,461,000 | 17.98 | 75 | 34,095,750 |
| $100.01 to $500 | 616,098 | 18.10 | 107,584,000 | 42.55 | 50 | 53,792,000 |
| Above $500 | 41,077 | 1.21 | 43,960,000 | 17.39 | 25 | 10,990,000 |
| Total | 3,404,126 | 100.00 | 252,849,000 | 100.00 | | 154,721,750 |

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman regard these payments as political payments rather than real soil-conservation payments?

Mr. HORAN. I am afraid that I will have to because they are not large enough to conserve a farm and the farmer still has to use his own best judgment to conserve his soil.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's committee provided $165,000,000 for this.

Mr. HORAN. We provided that in our best judgment to carry out the practices for 1947.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman regards these as political payments, why did he allow $165,000,000 to come out of the taxpayers' pockets for something that he considers a political purpose rather than a soil-conservation practice.

Mr. HORAN. Simply because it was pointed out to us that the commitments had been made.

Mr. COOLEY. All right; but if political commitments were made, certainly the Republican Party is not interested in keeping political commitments. The commitment was for $300,000,000.

Mr. HORAN. The commitment was for what we estimated the amount to be and we felt it should be carried out.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one thinks any more of WALT HORAN than I do or appreciates the value of his services more. I am sure the statement he has made here today is based not upon the knowledge he has of his own business, which is apple growing, or pear growing, but upon his ignorance of the soil-conservation practices for which the payments are made. If my good friend, WALT HORAN, could go down to the grass roots and see the purposes for which these payments are made and see the cost to the farmer who gets these payments he would see that practically none of these payments are not earned. When you are planting nitrogen in our soil by cover crops, is that political? It is preserving the soil in the best possible natural way. It costs money to earn these payments from the Government.

It has been slurringly charged here that these are political payments. Gentlemen, I assure you nothing could be further from the truth. If you want these soils preserved and if you want these little farmers who could not possibly sow an acre in a cover crop without them, then all you have to do is to break your pledged word to these farmers who relied upon it.

I want to read to you from last year's RECORD when our former distinguished colleague, Judge Tarver, of Georgia, offered a committee amendment unanimously adopted by the Subcommittee on Agriculture—if my information be correct—for this $300,000,000 pledge. It is our promissory note. He said:

> Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program, $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.
>
> But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicity so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.
>
> I may say that I have submitted this amendment to the members of the subcommittee and it is, therefore, offered as a committee amendment, since it met with their approval.
>
> I hope the amendment will be adopted.

So it is not now that you should act unless you mean to cut, but if we write this pledge for $300,000,000, then we must keep it in the next appropriation bill. Then we could also refuse, if you want to, future payments. So I am here in honesty and good conscience, never more serious in my life, to say that we have no moral right to fail to pay the promissory note we wrote in last year's appropriation bill and upon which three-quarters of the farmers of this Nation have acted in good faith, and spent at least 80 percent of the money that Uncle Sam promised them to improve their land, plus their sweat and blood that went in, in addition, in the faith they had in the integrity of the Government and its pledged word—the law we wrote and made a statute. So if you wish to reduce such payments for succeeding years, then go ahead. Slaughter the whole program, if you wish. That is within your moral right, but you have no moral right to fail to pay, now that it has matured, your promissory note that you wrote last year for $300,000,000. If you want to continue at that same level, it is the best money you can invest in the future of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the budget reductions recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the Department of Agriculture concerns me a great deal. It should concern every individual in this country for all of us, particularly those living in metropolitan and industrial areas, are entirely dependent upon the farmer for the maintenance of our specialized type of economy. We have only to look about us to the other less fortunate nations to see this fact. England's food situation is desperate. She, along with India, China, Italy, Greece, Germany, and various other nations, is sorely faced with the effect of the population pressure upon the land, and the inability of their own agricultural resources to provide adequate sustenance for their peoples.

Our population has now reached 141,000,000 and the population is continuing to increase at a rate of about one-half million people each year. Our position as the world's wealthiest and most powerful nation is, in a large measure, to be attributed to the ability of the farmers and ranchers of this country to adequately provide food and fiber in such abundance that we have been able to maintain one of the world's highest standards of living.

World War II is not too far back in our memories for many of us to recall the narrow margins by which we escaped serious food shortages. By no means is it so far back for all of us to recall the large quantities of food produced in this country for our allies. Few of us realize, however, that crop yields per acre harvested during the five war years—1942–46 inclusive—averaged a great deal more than during like periods in the past. Interesting comparisons are obtained by comparing yields dur-

ing the 5 years, 1942 to 1946, with the 5 years, 1929 to 1933.

Here are a few comparisons: Corn yields increased 42 percent, grain sorghum yields increased 25 percent, feed grain yields increased 33 percent, wheat yields increased 28 percent, cotton yields increased 42 percent, and hay yields increased 19 percent. These figures are increases in yield per acre harvested, acreage increases during the war years not withstanding. These and other agricultural yield increases account in no small measure for the difference between victory and defeat in World War II. These yield increases cannot be attributed entirely to good weather or ideal production conditions, for the increases are not spectacular wartime increases. A study of the statistics reveals that they are a result of sustained year-by-year increases in efficient production.

These gains were made through years of effort and experience of good farmers, through years of research and educational services by the Department of Agriculture, our State colleges, our experiment stations, our Extension Service agencies, and through our soil-conservation programs. These gains represent dividends from the Government's continued investments in good farming and contribute immeasurably to the maintenance of our complex type of economy. To discontinue or to arrest the continuity of this work will constitute a disservice not only to farmers but to our entire population of this and future generations by endangering our continued effort to keep agricultural production ahead of our population increases.

There has been a considerable amount of half truths spoken and written in recent weeks concerning price support programs to farmers and its alleged contribution to the current high costs of living. Actually few agricultural commodities are supported or have been supported during the period since the end of the fighting. To be sure, prices have increased for practically all commodities, but such increases are inevitable during periods of prosperity. High incomes, widespread employment, and high rates of production mean rapid movement of merchandise, rapid rates of circulation of money, increased buying power, and a heavy demand for goods and services. But farm prices have not increased at a disproportional rate compared with nonfarm prices.

Let us consider a few facts that are revealed in the recent publication of Agricultural Prices, a monthly publication of the Department of Agriculture. Wholesale prices doubled between the 1935 to 1939 period and April 15, 1947. Retail prices for food also doubled. Farm prices, prices received by farmers, increased two and six-tenths times the 1935–39 average and the farmers' cash income from marketing increased two and seven-tenths times. The farmers' costs, or prices paid, including interest and taxes, increased one and eight-tenths times the 1935–39 average. The ratio of prices received to prices paid, including interest and taxes, but excluding the farmers' labor costs, increased only 40 percent. His wage bill, as represented by the index of farm-wage rates, increased three and three-tenths times the 1935–39 average. Weekly factory earnings had merely doubled during this same period. The farmers' income is somewhat enhanced by a 13-percent increase in the volume of farm marketings, but marketings of nonfarmers has increased considerably more than this.

The farmers' economic position undoubtedly is better than in the 1935–39 period and I am sure we are all glad that it is. But has improved financial position is partly accounted for by his production of much of his own household food requirements and because he can be and is more frugal. But his apparent financial condition must be partly discounted by the fact that he has yet to replace much of his farm equipment, the production of which was curtailed during the war period.

According to the Marketing and Transportation Situation reports of the Department of Agriculture, the public is still spending about 23 percent of its more than doubled annual income for foods. Had the people of this country purchased the same quantities of foods in 1946 as they purchased per capita during the 1935–39 period, their expenditures for food would have declined from 23 percent to 17 percent of their income. The difference between 17 percent and 23 percent, or 6 percent of the public's food bill, I assume, must be attributed to increased quantities of food purchased. A high rate of employment and increased wages has afforded more people better diets and a better living.

The position that this Government took with respect to obtaining the high wartime production for nonfarm sources required huge cash outlays and a heavy assumption of risks for capital investments and essentially guaranteed profits to the wartime producers of nonfarm items. The position it took with respect to farm production essentially was a guarantee against sudden price declines to protect the farmers' investments, not Government investments, in crops that took months—in some cases 14 to 18 months—to produce and market. Bear in mind the farmers' business turn-over, at best, is once or twice each year, while businessmen turn their stock several times each year. I dare say, the approach employed to obtain the agricultural production was and will be by far the more economical. Another 19 months remain for the Government to fulfill its obligations to the farmers. We, of course, must fulfill that obligation. Any abuses under the program should be brought to light and stopped, but we should not seek to penalize all farmers simply because minor abuses may be possible. Nor should we penalize the national welfare by the discontinuance, or retarding of research, educational and administrative programs that have so greatly contributed to our world-wide agricultural leadership.

The Seventy-ninth Congress laid the ground work for the enhancement of our agricultural leadership in the passage, by unanimous vote of both Houses, of the Marketing Research Act of 1946. This act, potentially, is the greatest positive piece of agricultural legislation passed by the Congress in many years. Thus far, however, it has been only a potentiality. Funds have never been appropriated so as to permit the Department and the State colleges to proceed to carry out the wishes of the Congress. We should not stand in the way of this program any longer. The time will come, altogether too soon, when the results of this program will be needed to facilitate the efficient movement of agricultural production to the urban consumers. Much can be done to enhance the value of our agricultural production—to farmers and to consumers—through the efficient placement of the products in the form and at the time and place people want and need those products. To delay this program further will tend to destroy a part of its value, for time is one of our more valuable assets.

A great deal of latitude is possible and feasible in the improvement of our marketing and distribution system. Continued pursuit of the solution of problems now affecting th esystem will enhance the value of our agricultural economy to the benefit of farmers, dealers, and consumers. Savings of food and fiber and their byproducts, and increased efficiency in the handling of these commodities and products means increased earnings to farmers and businessmen, lower prices and greater nutrition to consumers, and a greater wealth to this country. With conditions what they are in the world today, the sooner we get started with this program the better it will be for all of us.

I am unalterably opposed to appropriation cuts in the Agriculture appropriation bill which would force the Government to renege on its promises to the agricultural producers. I believe that some savings can be made, but I do not want the heart cut out of the AAA conservation program or any other vital and necessary service just for the sake of reducing the budget. That is false economy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the statement in last year's bill and the statement by the Department of Agriculture to farmers that payments upon fertilizer and lime to be used upon that individual farmer's land will be made subject to the approval of the Congress and to appropriations by the Congress makes a contract, then I cannot understand English. As a matter of fact, I think it might be of interest to the Congress to know and to realize just for whose benefit this operation is. Frankly, I have never had a farmer in my district—and it is an agricultural district—favor this operation to me. I have had many of them oppose it because they do not believe in subsidies. But I found out the other afternoon, beyond dispute, just what is the source of this operation and the support for it. It is the fertilizer trust and the National Agricultural Limestone Association. Their lobbyist, a fellow by the name of Robert M. Koch, was around to see me the day before yesterday afternoon. He had taken a poll of some people in my district, and of Mr. DIRKSEN's district,

and of Mr. PLUMLEY's district, and Mr. ANDERSEN's district, to find out how the farmers in those districts felt. I suppose these post cards were sent around to them by the fertilizer and limestone agents. He brought the thing in to indicate how strong the farmers were for it. I have not heard from a single one of them.

Now, I wonder, are we passing on a bill for the benefit of the farmers, or for the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust? It is about time we began to think about what we are doing.

Clearly, this item is for the benefit of the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust, and we ought to wake up and realize just exactly what it means. Why, the gentleman went so far as to indicate that if there was opposition to this, they would be able to see that none of these farmers voted the Republican ticket again. I am ready to meet that challenge. I do not believe the farmers in my territory are going to be run around by the nose by the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States is going to be a tool of, and supine to, the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust; and I hope that in opposing this amendment the Congress of the United States will show its independence of the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The enormous cuts in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture come as a shock to the American farmer who is being called upon now to feed the entire world. At no point in this bill are these cuts more disastrous than in the reduction of funds for the AAA program now administered by the Production and Marketing Administration. When appropriations were set at $300,000,000 for this item in 1946, a precedent was established, and in good faith the farmers have acted on that precedent. They depended upon it. Many of them have entered into commitments under it. Farmers performed their part of the bargain, and it is unfair that the Federal Government should repudiate its part of the program. Unless these cuts are restored, this is going to mean money out of the pockets of our farmers on matters that they have entered into in all good faith. In 1947 the farmers of Oklahoma were allotted $7,459,000 as Oklahoma's share of the $300,000,000 appropriation. Over 70 percent of these funds have already been spent. Increased interest in conservation has been so great that already many countries have spent all their funds. This is one of the finest programs ever authorized by this Congress. It is a program for America. It is a program to build up our own country. It is a program for the conservation of our soil upon which we depend for all the basic necessities of life. It is a democratic program largely carried out by the farmers themselves. In all respects its operation has been thoroughly American. I sincerely hope that the committee will restore the full amount of the budget estimates for the PMA. Next to our children, our soil is our greatest national asset. Yet, despite this fact, we find these enormous reductions in budget estimates, both in our triple-A program and in our program for school lunches which has been reduced from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. In its action on the school lunch item in the deficiency appropriation bill, this Congress has emphatically expressed its position with respect to this valuable program. I sincerely trust that it will restore the full amount of this item which, compared to the amount of money we have spent to feed foreign countries, is almost negligible.

In rescinding all section 32 funds, the Appropriations Committee is saying in effect that although the advantages of tariff to industry are to be maintained, no offset will be allowed to the farmer. This action, in my opinion, will mark the beginning of an unfortunate precedent. I sincerely hope that the Committee will see fit to restore this item.

Many of the reductions in the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget contemplated in this bill relate to loans on which the Government has made a profit. This is certainly true of REA. This program is not a gift to the farmers; it is a profitable investment. Every dollar spent for this program is coming back to the Government with interest. In many sections of the country this program is in its infancy. In many counties in my own State and district, it is just getting started. In this bill we are saying to farmers in such areas that they are not entitled to the benefits which have already been extended to farmers in many other sections of our country. The farmers are prosperous, and in times of prosperity they desire to build up their farms and to enhance their value for the future.

Likewise, our farm-tenancy loans, which have been considered the highest form of risk, have already proved in practice that they are sound. This program benefits the small farmer, the tenant farmer. It is a program which is converting many sections of our country from that of farm tenancy to one of home ownership. It takes no persuasion to convince anyone that home ownership is the foundation of a stable democracy.

I trust that this House will not break faith with the American farmer. I trust and sincerely hope that we may be able to restore the drastic cuts which have been made in the budget estimates for agriculture in many particulars. We all want economy but not false economy, not economy which will cut the heart out of our farm program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a time to limit debate and whether Members who want to be heard just want to extend their remarks.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am a farmer. I have been extremely close to the agricultural programs since 1933, and was chairman of my county AAA committee from its inception until in 1942 I was made a member of the State AAA committee, and subsequently chairman of the State committee. During the period from 1933 to 1945 I participated in most of the national conferences which developed the detailed operational programs provided for by the Congress. During much of this same period, I was president of the association of vegetable producers in my State, and served for many years as a member of the national fruit and vegetable committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I also served for a period of time as chairman of the Virginia Peanut Growers Committee.

One of the basic policies in existing legislations is concerned with the maintenance and improvement of soil fertility. The agricultural conservation program has contributed immeasurably to the resources of our soils and to the productivity of our national agriculture. In the appropriation bill last year, the Department of Agriculture was authorized to develop a program of agricultural conservation for the current year to the extent of $300,000,000, to be appropriated by this Congress. I question the wisdom of so drastic a curtailment as is proposed in this bill. I do concur in the belief that producers generally are financially able to bear a much greater proportion of the costs of conservation practices than they are now doing. I believe the authorization for next year can be substantially reduced without seriously retarding the constructive conservation that has been started, but I do not think it wise to completely eliminate provision for sponsoring agricultural conservation in future years.

I do not think we can classify agricultural conservation as a subsidy to farmers. The protection, preservation, and upbuilding of our soil's resources is of extreme importance from the standpoint of national welfare. In spite of all our educational activities among farmers, and in spite of the tremendous amount of progress that has been made toward developing in them a consciousness of the necessity for protecting their soils, the time has not yet arrived when individual farmers, acting entirely on their own volition, will carry out conservation measures which are so necessary for the protecting of soil fertility, and for the assuring to our Nation agricultural productivity adequate for our needs.

From my long association with our various agricultural programs I am not convinced that the present Federal policy toward agriculture is the best policy to pursue in the indefinite future. I have some convictions with respect to changing our approach and eliminating the detailed involvment of the Federal Government into the production, habits, and procedures of individual farmers. I think we can avoid any semblance of regimentation, and simultaneously promote a sound agriculture in the best

interests of our Nation. I am planning to offer certain suggestions of this nature for the consideration of the Agriculture committee.

Until we have improved legislation with respect to agriculture, I think it is incumbent upon us to utilize to best advantage, and as economically as possible, those facilities which are provided in existing legislation. I think it would be unwise for us to eliminate all our emphasis on soil conservation and believe we should approve this amendment.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting an increase in the appropriation for soil conservation and for the Production and Marketing Administration for the reason that for generation after generation, we have been exploiting our soil—the greatest heritage which God has given to us and our children; and only recently have we begun to replenish that soil.

This is not alone the responsibility of the individual farmer, but it is the responsibility of the Government of the United States. Fundamentally, the stability of this country rests upon its soil. When that soil is depleted to such an extent that it will not sustain our economy, then we must go the way of the great nations of the past who neglected that great heritage and went into decay.

To deny these funds now, in my opinion, would be one of the greatest mistakes in judgment that the Congress of the United States could make. We are just beginning—the real surface of soil conservation has only been scratched. I think now, especially, when we are heading into a new period of world recovery when not only the fate of our own Nation but the fate of the world is tied up in whether or not the people of the world have plenty to eat and plenty to wear, it would be particularly tragic if we, the Congress, should recoil from our responsibility and affect a penny-wise, pound-foolish economy.

It is needless for me to stand here and argue to the Congress the merits of soil conservation. It would be childish indeed, because the benefits are well recognized, and the fruits of the program speak for themselves.

So I shall not take any more of your time, but my vote is for an increase in the appropriation.

(Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that so much politics has been injected into the nonpolitical subject of an agricultural appropriation bill. The Nation cannot survive without food and fiber. This food and fiber are and must be produced by agriculture. Yet it is apparent that there are those among us who are more interested in making this a political bill than they are in the well-being of and production on the part of the farmer and economy on the part of government.

Everybody concedes that during the last political campaign the Republican Party promised elimination of all possible waste and pledged itself to the strictest economy in the operation of government, including the Department of Agriculture. In keeping with this pledge, every item in the President's budget has been carefully scrutinized by a diligent subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. Weeks have been consumed in this study. The Department has been required to justify every request made in its budget. This has been an interminable job on the part of the committee. Be it remembered that the testimony in the hearings before this subcommittee was taken down in shorthand and is before us today for consideration. These printed hearings have been available for study by members generally. The volume consists of printed pages and is mute evidence not only of the painstaking care of the committee but also is proof that the cuts made in this bill are justified.

Yes, these printed hearings prove conclusively that cuts were not made with a meat ax, as alleged by some of the speakers. The whole Department, and all of the activities in the name of agriculture carried on by the Department, have been laid on the operating table and the parts of the organization unnecessary to efficient functioning have been eliminated. A reading of these hearings is conclusive proof that the delicate knife of the surgeon has been used; that there has been no meat-ax operation, and that only nonessential expenditures have been eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between essential things and desirable things. With a national debt of approximately $260,000,000,000 we must take stock of our resources and our ability to pay. We can all think of improvements in our homes and of desirable changes possible, but none of us would think of making these changes if in doing so we were marching directly toward bankruptcy. Our country must be kept solvent. There is a limit to the amount of money the taxpayer can contribute to government, and the people are demanding that the Congress recognize this fact, cut expenditures, balance the budget, provide for the payment of the national debt and proceed from here on out on a sound fiscal basis. Now this cannot be accomplished without more economy in government, and there is only one way to bring about this economy and that is by cutting and reducing every penny of outgo that is not absolutely essential at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, as I have told the House so many times, I represent one of the most productive agricultural districts in the country. Our activities on the farm are varied and there are few provisions in this appropriation bill that do not have a direct bearing on some part of agriculture within my district. Consequently I am vitally and earnestly interested. I want to do the right thing for my district. I realize, however, that the prosperity of the country and the well-being of the several congressional districts are dependent upon the national economy, and that it takes prosperity in all of the districts to make national prosperity. There are some cuts in this bill which do affect my farmers more than farmers in some other districts. Naturally these constituents do not want these cuts and have so advised me. However, I have faith in them, and when they consider the national picture I feel sure they will not ask for favors in their particular cases. The real trouble in bringing about economy in government is that, while each group and most individuals favor economy, yet all want the economy applied to the other fellow.

In popular vernacular it is not a question of "let George do it," but it is a question of "do it, but let George pay for it." It is just too bad that the honest, sincere, and conscientious effort of the Appropriations Committee to keep faith with the people and weed out wasteful and unnecessary expenditures is being made a political football. I feel sure that no one will accuse me of being offensively partisan in the consideration of any legislation. It is true that the Republicans, preceding the last election, did promise to reduce the number of Federal employees and to bring more economy to the Government. I thought that in this effort the cooperation of the Democrats could rightfully be expected. Apparently I guessed wrong, because up to this good hour, while this appropriation bill is being read for amendment, there has been a solid Democratic vote against practically every cut proposed by the majority. Yes; most of the Republicans have voted for the cuts, yet partisanship has not so unanimously prevailed. There has not been a vote on an amendment where the Republicans voted on strict party lines. Indeed, the well-being of agriculture is not and should not depend entirely on the edict or strategy of any political party organization.

If a Member is convinced that a reduction is not justified and will injure rather than help the country, then he is doing wrong if he does not vote accordingly. On the other hand, if he responds to a crack of a political party whip, for political purposes only, then he is doing his country a disservice.

Mr. Chairman, I have given careful attention to the printed committee report. I have gone through the bill. I regret that in my opinion the safety of our country requires the elimination of some worthy activities on the part of the Government for the time being; that is, I favor doing some of the things suggested in the President's budget but, under all the circumstances, am convinced that this is not the time. I know, as we all know, that when this bill goes to the Senate additional sums will be added, and that the final Agriculture appropriation bill will be a compromise between the views of the two Houses.

In voting for this measure, I am giving due consideration to the studied conclusions of the committee reporting the bill, which knows more about the details than the rest of the House can hope to know in the time which can be given for consideration.

In conclusion, may I beseech the Members to forget the center aisle which divides our seats politically? Let us think entirely of our responsibility to agriculture and the country at large rather than

campaign issues in the 1948 election. Political strategy is all right in its place, but it is entirely out of place when dealing with a nonpartisan question upon which the very existence of the Republic rests.

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can agree to a limitation of debate on this section.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not spoken on the bill yet. Unless I can get 5 minutes I will object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the membership should realize that if everybody is going to be recognized on every amendment we are going to be here for a long, long time.

Mr. BROOKS. What is wrong about giving the farmers a break?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That sounds interesting, of course.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section of the bill and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 15 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. That is perfectly agreeable, with 15 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that there may be no misunderstanding the Chair will read the names of those seeking recognition at the time the motion prevailed: Messrs. ANDERSON of California, POAGE, BROOKS, WOOD, ALLEN of Louisiana, PACE, CASE of South Dakota, WHITTINGTON, and 15 minutes for the committee.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

A MATTER OF HONOR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, whatever I shall say is not prompted by the Fertilizer Trust or the Limestone Trust. I do not think either of them operate in my congressional district or in South Dakota to any extent. What I shall say goes to the question of the moral obligation of this Congress.

In passing, however, in order that the country may know that the ranchers in my district earn their payments I wish to say that the great bulk of these payments go for building stock-water dams.

Mr. Chairman, the year I was first elected to Congress was 1936, one of the tough drought years in the northern Great Plains. In 1934, and again in 1936, I campaigned on the slogan "A dam, an irrigated garden, and some trees on every farm in western South Dakota." When elected, I pursued every honorable course to make that goal come true.

I proposed the use of the old resettlement grants to encourage water conservation. I supported the Water Facilities Act. I wrote the bill which was called the Case-Wheeler Act, or, more officially, the Water Conservation and Utility Act, to get double duty from relief dollars. I urged that the old triple A program place its emphasis upon actual water-conservation practices. I supported at every opportunity the building of stock-water dams as the logical conservation practice for these payments in my district.

And I have seen a transformation in the water resources on the ranches in my congressional district in the last 7 years.

In 1940, in my district alone, 8,040 dams were built on 7,746 farms or ranches. In 1941, there were 6,347 dams built on 6,101 farms. The program slackened a bit during the war because of labor and machinery problems, naturally, but still progress was made. And in 1946, the first postwar year, 7,788 dams were built on 5,831 South Dakota farms, of which 5,565 dams were on 4,178 farms in my congressional district.

Since the inception of the program in 1937, the first year I was a member of Congress, through 1946—10 years—there have been constructed a total of 57,812 dams on 51,147 farms in South Dakota, 70 percent of which are in the western half of the State, the so-called short-grass country. The dirt moved in building these dams totaled 76,194,754 cubic yards.

Along with this dam-building program went tree planting, rotation grazing, and contour stripping. I mention these things, Mr. Chairman, to dispel once and for all any idea that in my district the fertilizer trust has anything to do with the program, or that any such trust has anything to do with my attitude in this matter.

The people in my congressional district work for these conservation payments and these exist to show what they have done.

I will, of course, agree with anyone who says that good as any program may be, there may come a time when you cannot afford to put out the cash for it. If the time has come to say that we will not authorize a conservation-payment program for next crop year; that is one thing, and the sound-thinking people of my district will not complain if that is the situation. I have never seen the time, however, Mr. Chairman, when it was desirable to welch upon an obligation, either individually or nationally. And it is to that point I now address myself.

A year ago when this matter was before the House of Representatives the gentleman who was then in charge of the bill, Mr. Tarver, of Georgia, specifically called attention to the fact that there was language in the bill which proposed to put a ceiling upon the amount of these practices for which 1947 contracts might be entered into with the farmers. He called attention to the fact that that was a ceiling of $300,000,000. After directing attention to it he then offered an amendment and advised the House he was doing it so that it would in effect make the ceiling also a floor and permit the representatives of the Department to enter into contracts with the farmers on the basis of conservation practices amounting to $300,000,000.

The amendment specifically changed the language in the proviso of the bill with that avowed intent.

Mr. Tarver had called attention to what he proposed to do in advance of offering the amendment and then when he offered it did so in these words:

I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 8, 1946, page 2081:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicitly so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.

I may say that I have submitted this amendment to the members of the subcommittee, and it is, therefore, offered as a committee amendment, since it met with their approval.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wish to see if I thoroughly understand the amendment. The bill as now written puts on a ceiling of $300,000,000 for next year.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand it, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment, we have in effect approved $300,000,000 for next year without either putting it up or down; in other words, it is a kind of floor as well as ceiling.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 62, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that this issue was raised as specifically as the English language could raise it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] asked:

As I understand it, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment we have in effect approved $300,000,000 for next year without either putting it up or down; in other words, it is a kind of a floor as well as a ceiling.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Immediately thereafter the chairman put the question and the amendment was adopted. The record is clear.

The representatives of the Department were entitled to lay out the program in the various States upon the basis of a $300,000,000 program for this crop year of 1947, and they did so.

Now, there may be some Members who can salve their conscience by saying somewhere, in fine print, upon the contract submitted to the farmer—there is some suggestion this thing might be

changed by a subsequent appropriation of Congress—but my conscience permits no such evasion.

Under the language of the record as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1946, I cannot go to the farmers and ranchers in my district who have engaged in contracts for the building of dams and who are now told, many of them, that under the cut proposed they will have to refund the money already received and paid for contracts for the building of dams into which they have already entered, and qualify the promise that was made by the House of Representatives and, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to do so.

I shall vote for the pending amendment, as a matter of honor as I interpret the record.

(Under permission subsequently granted by the House, Mr. CASE of South Dakota appended the following table to his remarks:)

*Dams and reservoirs, 1940–47*

[Dirt in thousands of cubic yards]

| County | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 | 1944 | 1945 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bennett | 112.0 | 86.9 | 16.3 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 1.3 |
| Butte | 471.2 | 63.3 | 303.4 | 313.6 | 300.5 | 523.6 |
| Corson | 275.7 | 283.6 | 78.8 | 62.7 | 41.7 | 146.7 |
| Custer | 221.4 | 167.9 | 141.0 | 127.4 | 135.2 | 269.6 |
| Dewey | 418.4 | 470.0 | 161.4 | 181.7 | 191.8 | 233.2 |
| Fall River | 609.1 | 541.9 | 367.3 | 239.9 | 307.5 | 415.8 |
| Gregory | 247.7 | 188.4 | 260.7 | 155.7 | 151.3 | 189.8 |
| Haakon | 633.5 | 569.6 | 415.3 | 325.2 | 440.6 | 580.8 |
| Harding | 607.4 | 435.9 | 255.6 | 165.4 | 169.9 | 198.3 |
| Jackson | 200.8 | 177.7 | 203.8 | 139.1 | 131.3 | 240.2 |
| Jones | 104.4 | 411.1 | 153.1 | 332.4 | 360.8 | 701.0 |
| Lawrence | 30.3 | 11.7 | 20.5 | 18.1 | 45.8 | 61.0 |
| Lyman | 617.6 | 424.1 | 307.9 | 266.1 | 417.7 | 422.5 |
| Meade | 862.1 | 865.6 | 517.8 | 454.7 | 499.3 | 837.9 |
| Mellette | 408.1 | 359.4 | 263.2 | 264.5 | 267.1 | 436.3 |
| Pennington | 538.1 | 547.4 | 292.4 | 359.7 | 344.4 | 610.1 |
| Perkins | 353.6 | 447.4 | 211.0 | 205.1 | 124.8 | 325.0 |
| Shannon | 128.4 | 127.5 | 25.7 | 24.0 | 7.8 | 19.2 |
| Stanley | 294.1 | 375.4 | 283.2 | 230.2 | 318.6 | 356.4 |
| Todd | 161.4 | 123.8 | 21.8 | 32.4 | 25.9 | 73.2 |
| Tripp | 249.9 | 252.4 | 247.2 | 230.0 | 160.4 | 343.6 |
| Washabaugh | 163.1 | 80.8 | 24.8 | 26.7 | 17.1 | 36.9 |
| Ziebach | 612.3 | 546.5 | 306.0 | 337.6 | 233.1 | 227.2 |
| Total | 8,320.6 | 7,558.3 | 4,878.2 | 4,500.3 | 4,698.2 | 7,249.6 |

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, hesitant as I am to take the time of this House to again read the record to which reference has been frequently made, I cannot fail to ask each Member to read once more pages 2080 and 2081 of the RECORD of March 8, 1946. That is the record of this House when it considered this bill last year. A part of that record reads:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Committee amendment offered by Mr. Tarver: on page 48, lines 21 to 23, strike out all the language within the parentheses and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'amounting to $300,000,000, including administration.'"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program, $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicitly so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.

I may say that I have submitted this amendment to the members of the subcommittee and it is, therefore, offered as a committee amendment, since it met with their approval.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wish to see if I thoroughly understand the amendment.

The bill as now written puts on a ceiling of $300,000,000 for next year.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand it, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment, we have in effect approved $300,000,000 for next year without either putting it up or down; in other words, it is a kind of floor as well as ceiling.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 62, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

There may be Members who feel that they can escape responsibility for this commitment by citing the fact that the Department of Agriculture has always shown a suspicion of the promises of Congress and has put some fine-print provisions in most of the conservation contracts with farmers advising that the payments were contingent on congressional appropriations. I am not one of those who feel that I can break my promise on such a flimsy pretense. As a matter of fact, the Congress has given its solemn promise that the farmers would have $300,000,000 for soil-conservation payments during the crop year of 1947. The farmer could well understand the warning of the Department of Agriculture and still rely implicitly on the direct promise of the Congress itself. You and I made that promise. I am going to try to keep my promise. I wish that all of my colleagues on the majority side would join with the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee and some 8 or 10 other Members who evidently respect their promise even in the face of party pressure. No one can read the record and seriously deny that this House did promise the farmers of America that they would have $300,000,000 for soil-conservation practices during the crop year of 1947.

We told the Department of Agriculture that they should work on a program of $300,000,000—not more and not less, but exactly $300,000,000. They have worked on that kind of a program and they have made promises to the States on that basis. The law required the allocations to be on the basis of $300,000,000. The money has been promised to the counties on that basis. The law we passed so required it.

So that those of you who do not understand this may know just how it works, I will give you an illustration from down in Texas, and it works the same way in every State. The $300,000,000 is first allocated to each of the several States. Then the State divides their allocation between the counties.

As an example, in Bell County, Tex., the county was allocated $129,200, to carry out the 1947 agricultural conservation program. Of this amount $110,656 had been obligated prior to May 24, 1947. Sixty-eight thousand three hundred dollars has already been earned. That is the farmers of Bell County have already done work which entitles them to more than this bill will pay.

In McLennan County, Tex., $140,600 was allocated for the 1947 crop year, and of this amount $110,589 had already been earned on May 23. That means that if we break faith with these farmers and give them only the half of what we promised, which the committee proposes, it will not only be impossible to pay for the work that has been done but, in addition, those farmers are going to have to refund to the United States Government at least $30,000 that they had every right to believe was theirs. Nor will it be possible for any of the farmers of McLennan County who recently signed up to receive any payment at all for the practices which he carries out.

This means that the United States Government, instead of carrying out its promise to the farmers, is going to find itself in the position of an Indian giver, going around and taking from the farmers what it solemnly promised.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has suggested that this program is simply for the benefit of the sellers of limestone and of fertilizer. I feel that this is a very unfair and unfounded charge. No processor of fertilizer gets a dime out of the construction of a terrace. No producer of limestone makes any profit from the construction of a tank or stock pond. As a matter of fact, this charge simply could not be true in my section of the country, and I believe my section has done just about as much as any section in the way of soil conservation. As far as I know, there is not a ton of limestone sold in

my district. Probably there should be, but our people feel that it is even more important to keep the soil where it is—to keep it from washing away. We use very little fertilizer. We should use more, but first we feel we must stop our soil from washing away. Maybe, when we have stabilized our soil, we will find ourselves using more limestone and fertilizer, but certainly for the crop year of 1947 the charges of the gentleman from New York are unfair and impossible.

Nor can I salve my conscience, as the gentleman from California does, by saying that it will be all right to break our promise because the farmers of California are rich. Unfortunately, my farmers are not rich. Unfortunately, even with present prices my farmers are making less than most factory workers. But if every farmer were as rich as the gentleman from California boasts his farmers are, it would not, as I see it, be any excuse for welching on our promise. If I sign a note, I try to pay it even if it falls into the hands of the richest man in Texas. I would hate to think that my Government was not as scrupulous in keeping its promises as I feel private citizens should be.

I have had no opportunity to discuss the merits of these payments. I feel that these payments have resulted in a real recognition of the importance of soil conservation. I feel that there is nothing more vital to the long-time welfare of our entire country than the preservation of our soil. I feel that it is clear that these expenditures are of tremendous benefit to our country. I think the bill should not only include $300,000,000 for the 1947 crop year, but it should also provide for a continuation of this worthwhile program. However, I cannot but fear that a committee or a party that will repudiate a solemn promise for 1947 can hardly be expected to give consideration to the needs of the future. Therefore, while I feel that this amendment should go further and make provision for a program for 1948, I shall enthusiastically support the amendment as being the very minimum that this Congress can do if it has any regard for the commitments of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to follow through a bit on what the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from South Dakota have said. I think it is tragic to break faith with a large group of the population of the country. It is especially tragic to break faith with the farmers, and that is what I think they are doing. But just as important, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is the result to the country and to the world generally of this breaking faith with those who till the soil. I have already heard from one farmer in my district who is disturbed about commitments that he has already made. He was out in the field working. He was out in the field plowing, seeking to produce the food and the fiber that this world needs so badly at the present time. He was out there as he should have been, and as millions of other farmers are today, working and producing. Word came to this farmer from Washington that there is a great disturbance in the farm program; that there is a great change going on up here in the plans that he thought he could rely upon in his planting season. He is disturbed mentally. He is disturbed financially, and the result upon his activity and his production in this country is going to be immediate. The country is going to suffer from this change and from this breaking faith by the Congress with the farmers of the Nation. We are going to have less food at a time when the world critically needs food. We are going to have less fiber at a time when the world is half clothed as a result of the greatest war in all history. And I say that perhaps above and beyond our breaking faith with the farmers in passing this amendment is the tragic result upon the production in this country and its effect upon the world as a whole. It is incalculable. I am truly sorry to see this provision in this bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, although I intended speaking on this bill later during the discussion, I cannot refrain from voicing my protest at the effort of the committee to force the Congress to invalidate binding contracts entered into between the United States Government and farmers all over America. The sum of $300,000,000 was authorized by the Seventy-ninth Congress on March 8, 1946 to be expended during the crop year 1947, under the soil conservation program. Unless we live up to our contract the American farmer will lose all faith in his Government, and rightly so. This program has meant much to the South and the West. It has been a good investment in from the standpoint of improving the soil. It has provided the needed incentive to cause the general upbuilding and improving of our soil. It is the only forward step our Government has ever taken toward this end. No one can deny that the program has been successful and I say, Mr. Chairman, that this fact, coupled with the legal and moral obligation made by the last Congress makes it mandatory that we adopt this amendment to carry on this vital program. I strongly denounce this entire bill and the political party who sponsors it. It is too much to hope for when we permit ourselves ever to believe that the Republican Party will sponsor any legislation favorable to the farmer. History reveals that they never have. In this matter now under discussion a sense of honesty and fair dealing demands favorable action on the amendment restoring this ill-advised cut. When we do this we can face the farmer and feel free from the guilt which will be ours if this amendment is lost. Let us not make the farmer the goat of partisian politics. Give him his just dues. God knows he is entitled to it if any group in America is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, it has always been my thought that the Congress of the United States should move cautiously on the question of the subsidization of any industry, but in the event that such subsidization is ever justified by the Congress it is my thought that the most deserving group in America is that group of men engaged in agriculture. I was in my home town last week end, at which time I was visited by a group of farmers, headed by the local chairman of the county organization. They presented me with figures to show that the farmers in that county, under the program that this Congress guaranteed to the American farmers last year on the 8th day of March, in the language that has been read to you by the gentleman who preceded me, have already earned under that program more this year than they got last year in the whole crop year.

In the presentation of the amendment which fixed this sum in the bill that was passed here in March of last year, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this appropriation, the Honorable Malcolm Tarver, of Georgia, used this very exact language in addressing the Congress, which was adopted by the House and written into the law, and it affects this crop year, and I want to read it to you. He said:

> I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

That was a challenge to the Members of Congress to determine then what the farmers might expect in 1947, and we here said then, "We will authorize this expenditure that is carried in this amendment for the crop year of 1947."

If this proposition were a private matter between any two individuals or corporations in America in a court of justice that sort of an implied agreement could be enforced by judgment of our courts.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Congress made it illegal for them to offer any other program except the $300,000,000 program, did it not?

Mr. WOOD. The gentleman is correct.

Aside from the merits of the program which the funds provided by this amendment are designed to finance, and my limited time forbids a discussion thereof, I maintain that this Congress cannot now afford to break faith with the farmers of America by now welshing on its pledged word which has been acted on in good faith by them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

[Mr. WORLEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, certainly no Member of Congress is naive enough to believe that an action taken by a preceding Congress can bind this Congress.

I call to the attention of the Members a few figures in connection with the farm industry in the State of California. I am from a section of California where the farmers are not dependent upon a dole to keep them in business. I come from a section of the country where we practiced soil conservation for many, many years before a paternalistic Government came in and told us how much lime, how much fertilizer, and how much cover crop should grow on our orchards and our farms. Look at this newspaper article from one of the counties in my district:

Twenty-million-dollar farm crop in Santa Cruz County recorded in 1946.

Remember that figure, $20,000,000—

Fruit and nut crops, $7,000,000; vegetable crop, $7,000,000—

And so on. Then way down here in fine print:

Government payments: Beef-production payments, $7,000; agricultural conservation, $35,000; sugar-beet program, $19,000; dairy subsidy, $52,000.

There is $114,000 in Federal payments out of a total farm crop in that one county of $20,000,000, and only $35,000 of it for agricultural conservation. To me it just does not make sense. If we are ever going to take the farmer off the dole, reduce Federal expenditures, and practice some real economy in this country, this is the time to do it.

Santa Clara County, the sixteenth richest agricultural county in the United States, is located in my district. Last year this county had crops which brought in $82,000,000 to the farmers of that county, one of the richest agricultural counties in the entire country. I now show you the report of the county agricultural commission. Here we are, "Agricultural conservation," under "Federal payments," $116,000, out of a total farm income of $82,000,000. I maintain we are still operating under an agricultural program that was designed to see to it that two-thirds of all the benefits for agriculture in the United States go to one-third of the farmers. It is not an equal program. If we are going to take the farmers off the dole, now is the time to do it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield with pleasure to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Many are predicting dire political consequences in connection with any cut that is made in the expenses of Government. However, I believe the temper of the people today is such that their votes are not for sale on that sort of basis.

What I should like to inquire of the gentleman is this: Out in my State of Indiana corn is bringing $1.81 a bushel, wheat $2.45 a bushel, soybeans $2.70 a bushel, and oats 95 cents a bushel. Does the gentleman believe the farmer out there feels that the Federal Treasury is expected to provide him with free fertilizer and free limestone for his farm?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I certainly do not, and as I pointed out earlier, now is the time to take them off the Government dole. This conservation program is not needed by farmers who know their business, who have practiced soil conservation for generations and who can run their farms without being told by the Government how high and how green their cover crops must be before they can collect an infinitismal amount of Federal funds for doing something they would have done anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

(Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard from two splendid gentlemen, one from the State of Washington and one from the State of California, who happen to live where the apples of Mother Eve grow the finest in the world they think. They would have us adopt a farm policy for the Nation depending upon the needs or rather the lack of needs of these two virtual Gardens of Eden. But we do not all have such wealthy regions to boast of. We are glad that these sections are so wonderfully blessed. Certainly nature has bestowed upon them a bountiful supply of the good things of life.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are not here legislating according to the measure of needs of the fattest sections of our fair land. These gentlemen perhaps feel that their sections are so prosperous that they do not need this assistance in rebuilding their lands and natural resources. We are trying to legislate for the average farmer in the Nation. I am speaking for the average farmer. I am speaking for the farmers, many of whom certainly are not able to do the things that people can do in the districts of the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Washington. Many of us live in districts where the farmers do not have all that means. Perhaps the most prosperous farmers in the Nation can do all these things alone without any help, but most of them cannot. But even regardless of that, Mr. Chairman, this question of rebuilding, conserving, and restoring our soils and natural resources is one which does concern the entire Nation, rich sections as well as poor sections. This is national, not sectional.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] indicated that the committee had put enough in this bill to cover the amounts of the soil conservation payments which have been obligated up to this time. Well, if that is what he and his committee meant to do. I would like my friend from Washington to listen particularly to what I am going to say. I know he is thoroughly honest. If that is his philosophy, I suggest to him that he has fallen far short of it because a great many of the parishes of Louisiana and the counties of the Nation have already taken up most of the allocation, and far more than the committee allowed in this bill. The committee allowed a little more than 50 percent of the amount requested, and the record shows that in many sections, particularly in the South, nearly 100 percent of the funds have been obligated. Up to April 30, 69 percent in Louisiana had been obligated.

Here is one parish in Louisiana which had an allocation of over $72,000 and as of April 30 they had taken all of the allocation up except $1,500. Here is another parish that had an allocation of $78,000 and on April 30 they had taken up all but $713. Another parish had an allocation of $62,000, and they had taken up as of April 30 all but $1,814. So, I respectfully submit to the committee that if they intended to do what the gentleman from Washington indicates, then the committee fell far short of that goal even at the time of writing the bill. It will take the full appropriation of $300,000,000 to meet the allocations made and soon to be made.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a question of honesty involved in this appropriation. What you want to do in the future is a question for the Congress to decide.

But here is a question of living up to what we Democrats think is a commitment made last year. I discussed this more fully yesterday in general debate and do not have the time in my few moments now to go into details, but to deny this appropriation seems to us going back on an obligation made last year and this Congress has not heretofore repudiated such and we on this side of the aisle are not going to do it now and we hope you on the left will not.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is 100 percent correct. I commend his remarks to your thoughtful consideration. His statement is sound. I appeal to you gentlemen on the left not to do this, not to cut this out at this time for the crop year 1947, at least. I appeal to you to support the full appropriation of $300,000,000 so that the farmers can go ahead and complete the work which they are doing for 1947, at least.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate on this bill on yesterday I stated that our soil was one of our Nation's richest resources. A look at what has happened in other countries, where the soil has been dissipated and permitted to wash away, verifies the truth of that statement. In a few minutes we will be called upon to vote on an amendment which will determine whether we will furnish the necessary money to carry on this program as set up, and which has resulted in the increased fertility and productivity of our soil, or whether we will take a backward step and withhold the necessary funds for the successful operation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri which provides for the funds, pledged to the farmers of America by Congress last year, for carrying on this highly beneficial program for agriculture during the crop year 1947. To withhold these funds at this time, after allocations have been made to States and counties and where payments have been earned, or partly earned, by our farmers, would be tantamount to a breach of contract made by our Government with the farmers of our country.

Mr. Chairman, on many occasions, since I have been a Member of this body, I have heard with pride the statement made from the floor of this House that our Government has always kept its agreements and has never repudiated a contract. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope we will not depart from this high principle by our vote on this amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, to avoid any misunderstanding it should be said that this paragraph does two things. First, it does not appropriate or authorize $1 for this program for the year 1948. That means that if the pargaraph is approved as it is, and that part is not touched by this amendment, this program will be completely terminated at the end of this year. That is what some have wanted done. I do not.

Then, secondly, this paragraph seeks to appropriate approximately one-half, or $165,000,000, of the $300,000,000 which the last Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to expend this year in this work. Someone said a moment ago that no one would be foolish enough to contend that this Congress is bound by the action of the last Congress. If this amendment is not adopted and $300,000,000 is not authorized, it will be the first time during my service in the Congress that the Congress of the United States has failed to carry out its own contract. If there is any doubt that the last Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to promote this program and the farmers to participate in it, I here have the appropriation bill passed last year with the section marked, which I would like to have anyone who has any doubt to come up and read. It authorized the program this year in the amount of $300,000,000. The committee will contend that the farmers were put on notice that that was subject to appropriation. I have the work sheet in my own State of Georgia. It does contain in fine print down at the bottom this language:

> Payments under 1947 are subject to appropriations provided for this purpose.

In the case of the State of Oklahoma there is no reference. In the case of Arkansas there is no reference. In the State represented by our distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and in Iowa and Michigan, I have the work sheet in my hand and there is no reference whatsoever as to being dependent upon appropriations or any other provision.



I insist that the question now is, Shall the Congress of the United States maintain the contract it made with the farmers of this Nation? Many of them have completed the practices; the program is of great benefit to the farmers and to the Nation and should be greatly increased. I hope the amendment to appropriate the full $300,000,000 will be adopted.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, the importance of the conservation of our soils, our greatest natural resource, has been repeatedly stressed during these debates. In my own State of Texas it is estimated something more than 11,000,000 acres of what once were fertile farm lands have been rendered worthless through erosion. Striking testimony to the neglect of soil conservation practices in other years. However, the vital question involved in this amendment is not whether soil conservation is a good thing or whether the particular activity which would be financed by the proposed $300,000,000 appropriation is in all respect the best program possible. The simple issue which has been made abundantly clear by the debate is that of common honesty.

As has been pointed out by numerous speakers the $300,000,000 under consideration is in keeping with the commitment made by the last Congress and upon which Government officials and cooperative farmers throughout the Nation have acted in good faith. It is to cover the program for the current crop year. Contracts have already been made. In many instances farmers have already made expenditures and in many cases funds have been allocated and spent and unless this amendment is adopted will have to be refunded by the farmer to whom they have been made.

I have received numerous letters from farmers and others in my district calling attention to the seriousness of this matter. I quote from one such letter:

> If this bill should go through as reported out of the committee, we wonder where the money is coming from to pay for the practices that have already been carried out, since the farmers did not have the money to secure the materials and they most surely will not have it now, to repay the CCC for the funds they have put out in assisting them to carry on conservation work.

This is a most serious matter. As I view it the Congress rests under the solemn obligation of keeping faith with our people. This we can do only by providing the $300,000,000 in funds the last Congress promised would be forthcoming. I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on the Soil Conservation Service appropriation. My State, South Carolina, is entirely covered with soil-conservation districts organized under our State law. All the districts are now receiving assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, but not as much as they need to get the job done in time. Much of the land in South Carolina has been farmed for over 100 years. Indeed, some of our South Carolina soil has been in production since the days of the American Revolution. During most of that period we lost a lot of topsoil through erosion despite the use of certain conservation practices, such as terracing and crop rotation, as well as our farmers knew how to apply these practices to their land. Although these early attempts at conservation did not succeed, at least they paved the way for a coordinated attack on the erosion problem such as I saw under way in the Broad River Conservation District and other such districts last fall. Local farmers are taking the lead in organizing groups to speed up the work but the farmers in my district tell me they need the continuing help of Soil Conservation Service technicians in planning and applying conservation practices on their land.

I was somewhat disturbed when I noted the small increase for technical assistance allowed the Soil Conservation Service in the President's budget. I was disturbed because I knew that new districts were being formed in neighboring States and, in fact, in nearly every State in the Nation, and that the increase allowed would not provide adequate help next year for the new district being organized this year. I feared, and I still fear, that the old districts will be asked to divide their technicians with the new districts. This will mean less help rather than more help for districts in South Carolina next year. We have made good progress and the rate of application of conservation has been speeding up year by year since 1941.

We cannot afford to slow down the conservation work in South Carolina now, so I want to recommend that this committee provide for the new conservation districts organized this fiscal year at the same rate at which all districts were assisted in this fiscal year. As I recall, this is something over $22,000 per district.

The need for conservation assistance of the kind provided by the Soil Conservation Service has not decreased; more farmers in more districts want it and need it. I ask that you increase the appropriation so that the old districts can go ahead at least at the 1947 level in 1948 and so that new districts will be provided for at the same rate as the old districts. This will require an increase of about $5,000,000 for the 1948 fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration a pro-

gram that the farmers of the United States are relying upon for the crop year 1947. Whatever be the views about a continuance of that program after 1947, the Congress has said to the farmers that this appropriation would aggregate $300,000,000 for the crop of 1947.

I think we might keep in mind that there is a difference between fertilizer and lime or slag. I ask any Member of this body who knows of his own knowledge of any payment that is being made this year or that was made last year for fertilizer under the terms of this appropriation. There is a difference between fertilizer and lime or slag. Slag and limestone are not fertilizer but they are soil building like Austrian peas and other legumes. I know of no limestone or slag trusts in Mississippi. There is no subsidy in the appropriation. Every dollar the farmer receives under this program has to be earned. It has to be a practice that builds up the soil or that drains the land. I know of no payments whatsoever for fertilizer in my State or in any other State. I have inquired from the committee if it has been the practice to approve reimbursements for fertilizer and I am told that no such testimony has ever been presented to the committee.

I just want to say whatever be the merits or demerits of this program, the committee is forestalled and prevented from asserting the demerits of the program because if it be just and fair to appropriate $165,000,000, it is certainly just as fair and just to authorize an appropriation for $300,000,000. We must not discriminate. If one farmer has received his benefits because he has earned them now, should another farmer who earns them next month or the month following be denied those benefits? I say, under the circumstances and under the terms of the Agricultural Appropriation Act passed by the House in March 1946 for the fiscal year 1947, for the 1947 crop year, the Congress of the United States cannot afford to break faith with the growers of agricultural products in this country who have earned the benefits, none of which are reimbursements for fertilizer.

While the payments are justified on their merits, I do insist that Congress should keep faith with the American farmers. The $300,000,000 was committed for the crop year 1947. The adoption of the amendment is imperative if Congress is to keep faith with the American farmers.

I extend to say that I remind the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] that while the President recommended for the fiscal year 1948 a reduction in the soil conservation benefit payments, the President was careful to state that Congress had made a commitment for the crop year 1947. There is evidently a confusion by my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and my good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] respecting fertilizer and limestone. I know there is a fertilizer trust and there may be, in some sections, a limestone trust, but fertilizer, as I use the term, applies to nitrates and phosphates. This is entirely different from lime and slag. Fertilizer is used to increase the growth of the current crop. Lime and slag are used for soil building by supplying elements lacking in the soil. I know of no payment under the act as now being administered for fertilizer. There are payments in connection with lime and slag. The payments must all be earned. They are for the benefit of the lands and the building up of the soil. They consist of improving pastures, conserving waters, better drainage, cover crops of vetch and peas. There must be no quibbling.

As shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1946, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Tarver, was careful to state, when the amendment that he proposed for $300,000,000 was approved, that it was a definite commitment for the 1947 crop. Personally, I believe that commitments directly and indirectly have been made that will require the entire amount, and I cannot escape the view that the $165,614 290 contained in the bill will not be sufficient to pay those farmers who have already earned their payments. I repeat that I shall not quibble. It isn't a question of the condition of the contract, nor whether the contracts have been signed. It is a question of the commitment of the Congress and of the practices of the farmers relying upon that commitment. If we fail to provide the $300,000,000 there can be no escape that we are not keeping faith with the farmers. It may be that contracts for about one-half, or for approximately $165,000,000 have been earned, but in practice, other payments have been earned in all probability that haven't been reported. Further, in actual practice payments are earned before the contracts are really signed. It begs the question to say that the contracts contain a clause that the payments are conditioned upon appropriations being made. The farmers know that the program in 1947 is in force, and they rely upon Congress to provide funds for carrying out that program in accordance with the commitment made by Congress when the agricultural appropriations bill was under consideration in March 1946, as I have said.

I believe in economy and the elimination of waste and extravagance, but there is a false economy.

I extend further to say that I oppose the elimination of section 32 funds. Under the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, section 32 provides for permanent appropriations. The farmers thus receive the equivalent of the tariff accorded to manufacturers. The retention of section 32 funds is essential. There are other acts that provide for import quotas and export subsidies, but these acts are interdependent with section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. There must be a program before the acts for export subsidies and import quotas on cotton or wheat or other agricultural products can be invoked or justified. There can be no program under existing law without section 32 funds.

In this connection, I have always advocated ample appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation and for the Rural Electrification Administration. I supported and will continue to support adequate appropriations to enable worthy tenants and worthy citizens to become home owners and land owners under the Jones-Bankhead Act, and under the Farmers' Home Administration. I will continue to support adequate appropriations for agriculture.

I gladly urged and supported an increase in the appropriations under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. Research is fundamental in industry. We should profit by the advances of industry as a result of research and investigation. The Research Act was passed to promote research in connection with the utilization of cotton, cotton seed, and the utilization of other agricultural products. The research of man often contributes more to human progress than the resources of nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is time for every man in this Congress to go on record against the proposed inexcusable scuttling of one of our most vital Government agencies—the United States Department of Agriculture. I am not so gullible as to believe that every man will. There are still too many one-tracked so-called economy-minded gentlemen in the House who can see no further than what can be kept in the Nation's pocketbook today—and let tomorrow go hang. In fact, some of them remind me of the housewife who, to save a few pennies on tonight's supper, is willing to buy inferior foodstuffs for her family. Because, gentlemen, that is what this cut in appropriations for agriculture will mean in the long run.

This is a question I feel particularly qualified to speak on. I am proud to say I was born and bred on a farm in Louisiana, our Nation's sugar bowl. I grew up there. I know the farmer's problems. I know his difficulties. I know his back-breaking toil, his heartsick disappointment in bad-crop years. And I know the invaluable help the Department of Agriculture has given him. And this is the help this bill would take away.

I condemn the cut in toto, but there are some phases of it that are even worse than others, if that is possible. For instance, the cut for soil-conservation research, which is something we should all be interested in—city dwellers as well as farmers. For without soil conservation our present bountiful crops cannot hope to be continued indefinitely. The soil will wear out. It will be eroded. It will be washed away. And without research we cannot have the knowledge of how to prevent this.

And in this connection I want to remind you again that in 1946 an amendment was offered on this very floor of the House to fix the AAA payments or soil conservation payments at a given sum, $300,000,000 to be exact, and at that time the House was given an opportunity to accept or reject the measure. It accepted, and thereby fixed a precendent. Not only that, it made a solemn commitment to our farmers. The program was signed. The farmers joined in in good

faith. This bill would be a direct blow to that faith. It would justify our farmers in feeling their Government had failed them.

I condemn the elimination of section 32 funds for surplus disposal. Farmers in every section are alarmed over this taking away of funds that were promised them, money that was dedicated to this purpose. The elimination is, in short, a denial of a solemn obligation, much the same as though a private individual defaulted on a note accepted in good faith by a friend.

Another point I would like to bring out is that the Department of Agriculture has, I believe, an enviable record of aggressive support for really constructive economy by their previous elimination of unnecessary personnel, excessive expenditures, and duplication of services. One would think then that this Republican-dominated economical Congress would appreciate this. But no. Full use was made of these voluntary savings of the Department by a failure on the part of Congress to require such drastic reductions in many badly overstaffed agencies of the Government which had failed to do any housecleaning on their own initiative.

And do not forget, gentlemen—all the farmers are not Democrats. Republican farmers will fall in this debacle too. The one-gallus farmer who works from "kin see to k'aint see"—or from dawn to dusk, the moneyed owners of the rolling wheat fields of our great Midwest, the gentlemen farmers of our historic South, the farmers on the rocky New England hillside—all will suffer. And I say to you, all are entitled to know to whom this suffering, if it comes, can be attributed. To the Grand Old Party—our Members across the aisle, who now willingly take credit for the bill, but who later may find themselves yelling for somebody to come and "help me turn this b'ar aloose."

But what I am asking the Members of this body is that we think of our country as a whole. Think of our farmers as the backbone of that country, as they are. Think of their unparalleled record during the war, when with insufficient labor, broken-down machinery, and every other man-made difficulty, their record was second to none in our winning our victory, helped only by God's bounty in providing good growing seasons, by the sweat of their own brows, and by the Department of Agriculture.

Or think of the matter selfishly, then, if you will. If our farmers are made to produce without guidance or help of any sort, inevitably the entire country will suffer. For the farmer is the lifeline for us all. Through no other source can we get foodstuffs for our families at prices we can manage to pay. Through no other source can we get the raw materials to run our great industries. Through no other source can we keep our commitments to the starving persons of Europe.

And speaking of food, there is one more subject I would like to touch on briefly. That is the school-lunch program, the appropriation for which has been cut from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000, while in the self-same bill many times this amount is carried for stricken people overseas. This cut would seem to me even more fundamentally shortsighted than that in the agriculture appropriation. By this cut we are shortchanging our citizens of tomorrow. It does not become us, gentlemen, who sit here comfortably fed, to deny bread to those children back home who are hungry. For I tell you this is not a matter of refreshments served at school by a prodigal government. It is often a matter of the difference between health and malnutrition for children of low-income families, many of whom come to school with little or no breakfast and for whom this school lunch is the only correctly balanced nutritious meal they have at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The remainder of the time has been reserved for the committee.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members on the left will not feel that I am too much disturbed about their political futures when I make this statement, but I do think that some of the things I may say may be worthy of their consideration when they cast their vote on this proposition. My time will not permit me to describe the calls which were made on the farmers of America to produce and to plant every available acre and of the Nation's interest in the fertility of its soil, our greatest natural resource. Nor do I have time to describe the great value of this soil conservation program to the Nation as a whole. But whether this is a good program or a bad, the Congress has committed itself for this amendment.

First, I should like to say that this argument—and the distinguished chairman will present this later—that a small percentage of the people get the larger end of these payments is beside the point. The whole purpose of this type of payment is for soil conservation, work on the land, and it is based on the amount and the cost of the work on the land. The more land on which those improvements are made the greater the amount the Federal Government will pay, still being only one-third of the amount actually expended. Where the amount of land improved is small the amount of payment by the Federal Government is small. Before a man earns $1 on the average he must spend out of his own pocket $2. The Federal Government under this program said that the Federal Government is interested in the fertility of our soil and in this great natural resource and if you folks who happen for a temporary period to own this land will spend $2 out of your own pocket to continue the fertility of that soil or to improve it, the Federal Government, because of its interest, will put up $1. That is the way the program has worked.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Reference has been made to the alleged fact that none of this money goes for fertilizer and limestone. My understanding is that this money in considerable measure does go to provide limestone and fertilizer.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me answer the gentleman from Indiana. I will say that on the average the expense to the farmer is twice what the Federal Government pays as a contribution toward this good practice. As far as fertilizer is concerned I have never known of a case where fertilizer was supplied, but limestone, yes. Limestone has elements that go to feed the soil and condition it.

The amount of payment is determined by how much a person spends out of his pocket to carry out this program. Here is another thing I would like to point out and that is that last year when this bill was considered Mr. Tarver fixed by his motion that the program for this year be fixed at $300,000,000. He stated in the House:

> I have submitted this amendment to members of the Appropriations Subcommittee and they are not opposed to it; and therefore I offer it as a committee amendment.

This amendment was adopted and was an outright commitment as to what provisions would be made by the Congress this year.

The claim and the contention of the Republican gentlemen on the left that notwithstanding that amendment last year that the provision of this contract between the Federal Government and the farmer who does his work does provide that it—his payment for his practices—is contingent upon the appropriation is correct. I agree that that is the general situation, the contracts did provide such language as that in most instances; but what I should like to call your attention to particularly is that while it does contain the proviso that it is dependent on your appropriations, the action of this Congress last year said there would be $300,000,000 appropriated. While therefore the contracts were dependent upon the appropriation, the action last year told the farmers what the appropriation would be and I say that what that language in those contracts really means is that if the farmers spend out of their own pockets a sufficient sum of money to obligate the Federal Government on its part to pay $600,000,000 that the payment by the Federal Government would be limited to $300,000,000 and the notice in the announcement or contract means that in that case the farmer could only expect his pro rata part of the $300,000,000 as a refund for his expenditures or in lime or other aids. I do not care about the rich farmers in the State of California, represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], who may well be able to stand this loss and contribute this money to the cause of the Republican Party because it seems so important to them. Last year when this Congress and the members of this committe said $300,000,000 shall be available for 1947, and the farmers acted, spent their money and earned it, it is up to us to see that the Government lives up to its contract, regardless of the rich farmers in the district represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

We gave our word. This Congress it is said is not bound by what the Congress last year did. Certainly the individual Congressmen are bound and I think morally the Congress is bound.

Mr. Chairman, I would make the payment to the richest man in California before I would break the word of the Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that does not interfere with the time remaining on this side, does it?

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, 5 minutes of the time is reserved for the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CANNON. The committee yields the last 5 minutes on this side to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee will be first heard from this side of the aisle. It is my understanding that we were to close debate and have 10 minutes available for that purpose. I do want the gentleman from Texas to have time and I thought that was understood in our arrangements. The Chairman has to refresh me as to what time is available.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the agreement that was reached, the last 15 minutes was to be reserved to the committee, of which the majority side would take 5 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Texas, and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RAYBURN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in the course of the discussion about whether or not we are confronted with a solemn obligation. I hope I am not insensible to my solemn obligations either in my private or in my public capacity. Let us determine, therefore, whether or not this program is contingent on action by the Congress. There is no better authority, notwithstanding all the words that have been uttered in the well today, than the man who sits at the top and directs this matter, namely, Mr. Dodd, the Under Secretary of Agriculture.

I asked Mr. Dodd in the course of the hearings whether or not it was made clear to the farmers that in every case the payment that was made for any kind of practice was contingent upon action by the Congress in providing appropriations, and here is his answer, and you will find it on page 1249 of the hearings.

This is the Under Secretary of Agriculture talking:

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is, therefore, made abundantly clear to every participant and cooperator that, before he signs up, there is one contingency involved, and that is that the program is necessarily contingent upon legislation and appropriations?

Mr. DODD. That is correct. That is made clear.

They printed it on the form. You talk about fine print. The print on this form is no finer than all the other print on it. There on the front page, not at the bottom, and not off in one corner, but across the middle of the front page of this farm plan are these words:

Payments under 1947 agricultural conservation program are subject to appropriations hereafter made for this purpose by the Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think that is generally true but I want to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that on the forms used in the State of Oklahoma there is no such language. Why there should be any difference I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The form I read from is for the entire western region.

Now let us pursue this matter of forms a little more. I sent to the Department of Agriculture through the instrumentality of our very capable executive secretary, Mr. Orr, for the forms for the crop year 1947. The money that is carried in this bill, ostensibly for fiscal 1948, applies to the crop year 1947. Here is a memorandum from the budget office of the Department of Agriculture:

Forms in connection with the 1947 program are not available, as they have not been approved by the Comptroller General.

There have been no signatures on the new forms as yet.

When you speak of the reassurances and the assertions that were made last year, obviously one Congress cannot bind another, and this Congress is free to take any action it sees fit. So what happens to this argument that something appeared in the hearings last year that is a binder upon the first session of the Eightieth Congress? That matter has suitably been determined here time after time that we are under no obligation in that respect.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking about this proposition of whether or not this Congress must necessarily be bound by the last Congress.

Mr. PACE. But it is not in the hearings, it is in the act itself; it is in the law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand, but that does not modify the fact that, in accordance with every understanding, and the understanding that is testified to here in the 1948 hearings, it is contingent upon the appropriations this Congress makes in order to make this program effective, and there is the language. How is it made available to the farmers? Here is the department's own story. They printed 971,500 copies of the State handbook, and in addition thereto they struck off millions of copies of circulars to get into the hands of every farmer. Here is the language, not of the chairman of the committee, but of the Department of Agriculture:

The information is made available, and it is the obligation of our people at every level to make that information plain for all cooperating farmers.

That is what the Department says, that they tell their people in the field that they must make it plain. So there is no obligation upon the Congress, by their own testimony, and it is entirely contingent.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity to present a few minutes' argument in behalf of an amendment of mine, which is at the desk, and which argument I was not able to present due to the limitation of time. Consequently, I am using this parliamentary maneuver to gain the floor and urge consideration for this amendment which will be offered shortly.

The $15,000,000 allocated in this bill for the county and township AAA committees will, frankly speaking, not do the job this year. As I said yesterday, these men will have just about as much to do allocating one hundred and fifty millions as double that amount. To me, the county and township set-up means the heart of our price-support structure. This is the machinery we must have so as to be ready to seal grains for the commodity-credit loans. These loans are the floor under our price structure, and without a decent price no farmer can live as they are entitled to live. I regret this necessity of our not continuing the triple-A payments, but, as I have stated before, Mr. Chairman, agriculture can do without these payments so as to help our Nation meet the tremendous national debt of $259,000,000,000. We, as farmers, are willing to contribute the triple-A payments to the United States in return for a floor under our farm prices. That floor is provided for through commodity-credit loans. I repeat, we need our county and township committeemen to service these loans. Where would we as farmers be without the Steagall amendment? The money in this bill will not do the job, and I hope that you people will see fit to further allocate to them an additional $5,000,000 for that purpose, so that we can preserve the all-important county and township committees, and pay them for their work, so that they will be available in the future for whatever operation which might be necessary to assure adequate minimum support prices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, let me make clear what is involved here. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota

deals with the administrative expenses for the conservation and use program. As the matter now stands, when the committee determined to cut back the amount of money that would be distributed to the farmers and left available $150,000,000 it became necessary, of course, to cut back the administrative expenses at the same time. If you did not do so, you would be in the unhappy position of spending nearly $7 in administrative expenses for every $43 of benefits distributed to the farmer. You arrive at that figure simply by taking $150,000,000 and dividing it by 3,500,000 cooperators. Then, if you took the amount originally had for administrative expenses, it would leave a very substantial amount to distribute a very small amount of money. The committee cut that back to $15,000,000 and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota increases it to $20,000,000.

The long and short of the whole matter is that we are trying to finish the work in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, but the gentleman's amendment would add $5,000,000 for administrative expenses. So he proposes to pay more money for less work. That amendment ought to be defeated because the Congress would be in an indefensible position in seeking to approve such a high administration cost for a modest amount of distribution.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Is the amendment now pending before the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the amendment he will offer and for which he sought time by making the preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause because the time for debate has been limited.

Mr. PACE. But it is not before the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not before the House. The vote will come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to increase the amount in this bill by the difference between $165,000,000 and $301,000,000. He proposes to raise this bill by a substantial $135,000,000. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. Chairman, if time is yet remaining, I might add this one thought. You know there has always persisted in my mind a statement written by Charles W. Kingsley, the great author. He said there are two kinds of freedom—there is the false freedom where a man is free to do what he likes, and there is true freedom where a man is free to do what he ought.

The whole story here is that there is some soil conservation that the farmers ought to do themselves instead of asking recompense out of the Federal Treasury.

We are trying to preserve a little of the initiative and that spirit of freedom that has been manifest in this country and made it so great and give the people a small measure of the load to carry instead of putting all of it upon the shoulders of the Federal Government.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 124, noes 126.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 151, noes 156.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 49, line 5, after the word "exceed", strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000".

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is any debate permitted on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair answers in the negative. All debate on this section has closed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The matter is not subject to debate. Debate has been closed on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has been closed on the paragraph. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 49, line 5, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,584,956."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 118, noes 137.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 81, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to bring to the attention of the House the latest development in the investigation of the frauds and irregularities which occurred in last August's primary election in the now famous Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, when a Member of this House, Roger C. Slaughter, my predecessor, was "purged" following endorsement of his opponent by the President.

It has just now been reported to me that last night—following yesterday's report of the county grand jury—the office of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners was broken into, the steel safe door on the records room was blasted off with explosives, and all of the ballot boxes containing the ballots cast in the primary election were removed and taken away. News of this latest outrage by the criminal political gang which has ruled Jackson County for many years was received this morning during a session of an investigatory committee of the other body, while the Attorney General of the United States was testifying before the committee.

Believe it or not, the Attorney General assured the committee that he intended to order an investigation of the circumstances. What he wants to do is apply a hasp and lock to the well-known empty barn.

He had his opportunity to investigate that primary election. It was a matter of common knowledge that there had been widespread fraud, miscounts, ballot stealing, and vote buying—all of the same things which had resulted in mass convictions in the Federal courts following the 1936 election. After last year's primary in Missouri, the Attorney General issued a directive to the FBI—allegedly to make a thoroughgoing investigation. We now know that he directed them merely to interview the members of the board of election commissioners and two reporters for the Kansas City Star, John P. Swift and Ira McCarthy, who themselves had investigated and exposed specific, flagrant instances of fraud and corruption. This close limitation on the scope of the activities of the FBI shows plainly that the intention was to whitewash, not to investigate.

Mr. Chairman, the man who called for the purge of Roger Slaughter in that primary election is the same man who, in 1940, while a Member of the other

body, bitterly opposed the reappointment as district attorney in Kansas City of Maurice L. Milligan, whose courageous devotion to the duties of his office had resulted in the indictment and conviction of a small army of election crooks.

I incude in my remarks at this point a copy of yesterday's report of the grand jury of Jackson County, Mo., together with certain telegrams which have been received in the last 15 minutes. I urge the Members of the House to read the grand jury's report in its entirety, and especially two paragraphs.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
JACKSON COUNTY, MO.,
AT INDEPENDENCE,
CRIMINAL DIVISION A, MARCH TERM, 1947,
*May 27, 1947.*

HON. JOHN R. JAMES: We, the grand jurors, sworn and charged to inquire within and for Jackson County, having in mind the charge given us by your honor, and having completed 8 weeks of investigation directed almost entirely to a consideration of evidence of irregularities and fraud in the August 6, 1946, primary election, in the several townships and voting precincts of said county and in the city of Kansas City, and the city of Independence, Mo., respectfully submit our report.

In our investigation we have duly examined and counted the ballots cast in a relatively small number of the precincts and have subpenaed and examined many witnesses.

In our investigation it was revealed that in some precincts ballots were deliberately miscounted and false returns made of the election results to the election commissioners. We also discovered wrongful, illegal, and wholesome marking of ballots, vote buying and bribery, and illegal participation of party workers who were not polling officials in the counting of votes, gross negligence, carelessness, and indifference on the part of judges and clerks in the performance of their duties.

MISCOUNT OF VOTES

The grand jury subpenaed the ballots, tally sheets, poll books, and other records from the election commissioners and recounted the ballots in certain precincts. Miscounts of shocking proportions were revealed. A significant fact is that where a sizable miscount of votes was found the count invariably was in favor of one factional slate of Democratic candidates. In not one instance in which a consequential miscount was found was the miscount in favor of a condidate other than the candidates upon that particular factional slate.

The grand jury recommends further investigation, including a complete recount of all ballots in the race for the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress for the Fifth District of Missouri, by the proper authorities. It is our belief that Roger C. Slaughter, in this race was deprived of the nomination by a fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud.

In the race for the Democratic nomination for presiding judge of the county court of Jackson County, Mo., the grand jury found a miscount in favor of John H. Thompson, and a miscount against Perrin D. McElroy, which was more than enough to deprive Perrin D. McElroy of the nomination.

In the race for the Democratic nomination for prosecuting attorney of Jackson County, Mo., the grand jury found a miscount in favor of James H. Anderson and a miscount against Michael W. O'Hern, which was more than enough to deprive Michael W. O'Hern of the nomination.

Our investigation revealed a deliberate, calculated, and premeditated plan to miscount and otherwise steal votes from these candidates.

MARKING BALLOTS FOR VOTERS

The election laws and the rules of the election commissioners are explicit and specific, that ballots may not be marked for voters except under certain circumstances and then only after an oath of assistance has been made by the voters. It is apparent that there was serious disregard of these laws and regulations by certain voters, workers, and polling officials, which resulted in widespread fraud.

VOTE BUYING

Our investigation left no doubt in the mind of the jury that an organized plan was set up by certain party workers to pay money to voters, and that some voters looked forward to and expected to receive money for their votes or for voting the names of others, either before or after they did so.

IMPERSONATION AND GHOST VOTING

Our investigation revealed that in certain precincts the names of some registered voters were voted by impersonators, and in some instances payments were made to the impersonators. This type of fraud can only be perpetrated by collusion and conspiracy.

ILLEGAL PARTICIPATION IN COUNT

Our investigation and indictments further reveal that improper and unauthorized persons were wrongfully permitted by the precinct officials to handle ballots and count votes, and otherwise participate in the preparation of the official returns as certified to the election commissioners. In certain precincts watchers and challengers, usually precinct captains, unlawfully and wrongfully took charge of the ballots after the polls closed and after the ballot boxes were opened through collusion with, or intimidation of, polling officials. In all precincts where this was permitted there was a wide discrepancy between the official returns as certified by the polling officials and the true count as determined by the grand jury.

NEGLECT OF DUTY BY POLLING OFFICIALS

It is the responsibility of all judges and clerks of election, individually and collectively to count, canvass, and tally all of the ballots. Our investigation has revealed that this procedure was not followed, and in some precints the ballots were unlawfully counted by only one or two judges of election, and that in some precincts the Democratic judges and the clerk alone counted all Democratic ballots while the Republican judges and clerk alone counted all Republican ballots. This practice lends itself to widespread fraud, and when followed plays into the hands of unscrupulous officials, and others, and can and does usually result in a serious miscount and fraud in the count of the votes cast. It is further revealed that the laws and regulations requiring all judges and clerks of election to count, canvass, and tally all ballots were consistently disregarded.

The jury in its investigation found that certain judges and clerks of election who served in that capacity on August 6, 1946, could scarcely read or write. The jury further found that in certain cases the judges and clerks of election had criminal records.

LACK OF MATERIAL RECORDS

We were handicapped in our invesigation by the fact that no record was furnished us of the names of the persons who served as watchers and challengers in the various precincts on August 6, 1946, and we were further handicapped due to the fact that we were not furnished by the Board of Election Commissioners in Kansas City, Mo., with a book of complaints of election law violations as we understand they are required by law to keep. It is provided in section 12183 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939, that "It shall be the duty of such election commissioners to aid in the prosecution of all crimes and offenses against this article, and they shall keep a book in which shall be entered all complaints against persons alleged to be guilty of the violation of this law, and when in the judgment of such election commissioners such offense has probably been committed, it shall be their duty to cause a prosecution to be instituted in accordance with he provisions of his article, and cause the parties to be punished accordingly."

It is recommended by the grand jury that in the future the Board of Election Commissioners at Kansas City require, keep and have available such records for examination.

FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

In our investigation of vote frauds we have confined our efforts, of necessity, largely to a recount of the ballots. The grand jury strongly stresses the fact that in an investigation of vote frauds and irregularities the great majority of the fraud can only be substantiated and proved by a thorough, scientific examination of the ballots and records by competent scientific methods by trained men. There were definite indications of conspiracy and irregularities requiring such expert services bearing on the identity of handwriting, pencil marks, finger prints, etc. It is a matter of general knowledge that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, has such expert examiners and facilities to carry on such an investigation. We strongly urge that the United States Department of Justice and the FBI enter this investigation.

FUTURE GRAND JURIES

Due to lack of time this jury has been unable to complete its investigation of vote frauds in the August 6, 1946, primary election as instructed by the Honorable John R. James. The jury recommends that other grand juries, both State and Federal, further inquire into this matter.

INSTRUCTION TO FOREMAN

The grand jury unanimously recommends and hereby instructs the foreman of this jury to forward copies of this report to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Governor of the State of Missouri in order that they may be fully advised of conditions as we have found them in the August 6, 1946, primary election.

COUNTY INSTITUTIONS

The jury inspected all county institutions and while in every instance the conditions were not all we desire, we did find a disposition on the part of the superintendents to make needed improvements insofar as their budgets would permit.

We found in our investigations several instances in which trained personnel had been put in charge. The grand jury commends this practice and urges that more employees of this type be obtained when, and where possible.

We wish to thank the Honorable John R. James, judge, the prosecuting attorney, James G. Kimbrell, and his staff, and Mr. J. A. Purdome, sheriff, and his force and in particular George J. Punshon, deputy sheriff, for their assistance, guidance and helpful cooperation.

Respectfully submitted.

Hugh C. Moore, Foreman; J. M. Slaughter, L. Robert Evans, John B. Spence, Nile G. Gilley, Jay W. Tice, B. J. George, S. S. Arnsome, Eleo. C. Wright, Jr., M. H. Sigfried, Paul Luther, Winfrey G. Nathan.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Yesterday afternoon the Jackson County grand jury, which has been investigating the election frauds committed in the Democratic primary August 6, 1946, filed a report in which it expressed the conclusion that Roger C. Slaughter had been deprived of the nomination by reason of fraudulent votes cast and other irregularities. The grand

jury further recommend that the Federal Government enter the case and that the ballots be counted by the appropriate authorities. Last night the vaults of the election commissioners were broken into and ballots and other records stolen. Full extent of this robbery not known at this time.

JACKSON COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR HONEST ELECTIONS.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Old House Office Building:*

The shocking revelation of the theft of election records in recent primary must challenge the most rigid investigation by all public officials having jurisdiction.

DAVID B. CHILDS,
*Chairman.*

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building:*

Everything lawfully possible should be done to protect sacred voting rights and to expose those who prostitute the ballot. Two World Wars and many personal sacrifices waged for decency in government.

EDWARD L. SCHEUFLER.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building:*

Stealing of ballot boxes to block further investigation of vote frauds in August primary is last straw. Senator Kem resolution indicates culpable action of Attorney General. Congress should investigate at once with view of bringing impeachment proceeding; expect you to take lead.

MILTON W. MCGREEVY.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Hope you support full investigation of ballot-box theft and the lack of attention by Federal Government to vote fraud.

RIDENOUR RAYMOND.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building:*

Just heard of the destruction of evidence on vote fraud. These incidents in Kansas City definitely need FBI investigation.

MRS. JAMES ERNEST TURNER,
*President, Twentieth Century Women's Republican Club.*

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The people of Kansas City are incensed at facts disclosed by grand jury investigation and by investigation pursuant to Kem resolution, showing certain Federal officials have impeded FBI investigation of vote stealing in August primary. Now the ballots have been stolen. Expect you to take lead in pressing congressional investigation with view to impeaching any Federal officials whose dereliction in office has aided guilty persons from being brought to justice.

GRANT STAUFFER.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*House Office Building:*

With the grand jury's report now completed positively proving election frauds it seems most necessary that Federal investigation be made to find out why the Attorney General's office took a hands-off attitude. I urge you to press this matter with all vigor to see that proper justice is dealt to all those involved in a most serious offense.

Regards,

ELMER C. RHODEN.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

The Honorable ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*House Office Building:*

The brazen and disgraceful theft of ballot boxes here following grand jury investigation and indictments is most shocking to all decent citizens of this community. Urge you to demand immediate congressional investigation of United States Attorney General's office laxity in not taking action this entire vote situation in Kansas City.

FRANK A. THEIS,
*President, Simonds Shields Theis Grain Co.*

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. A. L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress:*

Yesterday a Jackson County grand jury, after investigating irregularities in the primary election last August, submitted a report finding wrongful, illegal, and wholesale marking of ballots, vote buying, and bribery. Inasmuch as balloting for Federal offices was involved, I strongly urge that you demand a congressional investigation of this deplorable corruption of the franchise. According to press reports evidence of these crimes was presented to the Attorney General but no action was ever taken. I urge you to seek a congressional investigation of the failure of the Department of Justice to act in this matter and in line with the grand jury's report, make available the superior facilities of the Federal Government in unearthing all the irregularities to the end that guilty parties may be properly punished.

WALTER R. SCOTT,
*President, Missouri Republican Club.*

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building:*

Local grand jury has disclosed flagrant violation of law in connection with August primary. According to the press, this information was given to Attorney General of United States months ago, who refused to take action. Reported ballot boxes now have been stolen to destroy evidence. If Attorney General had acted, this could not have happened. Congress should immediately institute vigorous investigation, and, if investigation justified, take action to impeach culpable Federal officials. You, as our Representative, should take lead.

W. C. SHANK.

---

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 28, 1947.*

Congressman ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
*Old House Office Building:*

The theft of election records of recent primary is most disturbing. I believe all public officials having jurisdiction should immediately investigate.

LOU ELLA ADAMS.

Mr. Chairman, in the fifth paragraph of its report the grand jury says categorically that "It is our belief that Roger C. Slaughter in this race was deprived of the nomination by a fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud." On page 4 of its report, the grand jury declares that "There were definite indications of conspiracy," and strongly urges that the Department of Justice and the FBI enter the investigation.

How long will the Congress tolerate the kind of fraud, and violence, and election thievery which has characterized primary and general elections in Kansas City, Mo., for many years? It is a weak and evasive alibi for the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States to say that the laws are inadequate and ineffective. They were adequate and effective enough 8 years and less ago to convict scores of persons, representing the same corrupt political machine in Kansas City, who had been guilty of no more than the offenses committed in the primary of last August—offenses which have resulted in some 50 State court indictments during the last several weeks. If the Federal election laws require strengthening, the Congress should act, and promptly.

But so far as the perpetrators of last August's primary frauds and crimes are concerned, the time has come—to borrow words which made history several years ago—to move on them again. And I do not mean the small fry alone. When the investigation has been completed, Mr. Chairman, a far broader aspect of the situation may have been presented.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to state that no matter what is done in connection with the appropriation for soil conservation payments, I hope that we will not overlook the value of the county committee system or do anything to diminish its importance. Believing as I do that there is a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to carry out the program contained in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947, I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, to increase the appropriation to $300,000,000. When that was defeated, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri to increase the amount for administration in the field and supported a similar amendment on the part of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Whatever amount is finally appropriated by the Congress for soil conservation payments, the work will have to be done by the county committees. These committees, of course, have many other duties to perform in connection with agricultural programs. To them goes much of the credit for the success with which these programs have been carried on in the past. In the future, it is my hope that we will have more, rather than less, administrative control in the local communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee on the Sugar Act provision in this present bill. I hope the Members have in their possession the report. On page 26 of the report this language appears:

The amount allotted for payments to sugar producers under the budget is $53,623,885.

Further the report states:

However, the committee has decided to reduce the national office administrative expense item by $50,000, which will make that amount additional for payments to sugar producers.

My question is, in the event the administrative funds after you have cut them $50,000 are not sufficient to administer the Sugar Act, how could it be administered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the basis of all the testimony we are satisfied that there are more than enough administrative funds to administer this program. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado that we have increased the amount that will be available for payments to sugar producers so that a large area of sugar production may be brought into cultivation during this crop year. In addition I may say this has been quite a big program. The amounts that have been collected through the so-called sugar processing tax have averaged more than $15,000,000 in every year, so that the Federal Government has actually realized a reasonably substantial profit on this operation from year to year. We are confident that the money that is involved here for administrative purposes is ample for all administrative detail in connection with the administration of the act.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman. May I call the attention of the House again to what the subcommittee chairman has said, that this program on domestic sugar has not cost the taxpayers a single penny and has placed in the Treasury of the United States more than $15,000,000.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I commend my able and distinguished colleague from Colorado for calling this to our attention. I wonder if he can cite any other investment made by the Federal Government which brings a greater return. Not only have we reaped a $15,000,000 profit but we have supplied the Nation with sugar.

Mr. HILL. I might say to my colleague from Colorado that I think the sugar program has probably been the best administered of any program in agricultural activities during this administration.

There are a few things we must keep in mind. In the continental United States we must be careful how we proceed from now on in regard to increasing sugar acreages in other parts of the world and not curtail acreage from our sugarcane and sugar-beet producers.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Can the gentleman name any other governmental activity which shows a profit each year?

Mr. HILL. I cannot.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like also to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that according to the best reports from the sugar-beet industry there is now a surplus of sugar in this country. I might add that a committee of your Committee on Agriculture that has been looking into this sugar supply at the present time feels that there is not very much reason to hold down the American housewife in the use of sugar in the days just ahead.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 52, line 23, strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may arrive at some time limit, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto and amendments to amendments close in 20 minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto and amendments to amendments close in 25 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 126, noes 101.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I have protested so many times about this Government giving away billions of the taxpayers' money to foreign countries and disregarding our own people and country that in justice to my constituents and conscience, I must again raise my voice against the reductions for the Department of Agriculture appropriations, H. R. 3601.

Agriculture is the basis of the economy of our Nation. Agriculture is the backbone of our country; and anything which is done to weaken or take away the governmental services of this industry is bound to effect the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how members of the Committee on Agriculture and other Members of Congress representing farm districts can agree to reduce such items of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture as the school-lunch program, rural electrification, soil erosion, forest protection, production and marketing administration, marketing service, to conserve our natural resources, and all of the other services which are so important to our agricultural population, and all of which contribute so richly to the prosperity of our country.

Many of our veterans are taking up agricultural pursuits, and to my amazement, even appropriations having to do with programs and benefits for these ex-service men are being either discontinued or so reduced by the reductions in this appropriations bill that this deserving group will be deprived of assistance to which they had looked forward to being provided by their Government through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, many times I have pointed out on the floor of this House that it was my privilege to represent one of the most important agricultural districts of this country, and I take this opportunity to say that as the representative of my district I have opposed and I now do most vehemently oppose these reductions in the approprations for the important and necessary services to my district and agriculture in general.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, there is no man on the floor who is more interested in the school-lunch program nor more in favor of the school-lunch program than I am. I want it understood that the only issue before the House at this time, no matter what oratory may be heard upon this floor, is who shall supervise, who shall manage the school-lunch program; whether it shall be directed from Washington or directed locally; whether it shall actually be as it started out to be, a school-lunch program involving surpluses, or whether it shall become a complete nutritional program the jurisdiction over which rests no longer with the Committee on Agriculture but with the Committee on Education and Labor; and, finally, who shall pay for it.

I have had experience with this program. It has been my observation, and this can be supported by the facts, that the best programs have been those which have been supervised locally, managed locally, and for which, for the greater part at least, local or State money has been used. Such programs for years have been carried out by churches, Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and other groups like these, as well as by school groups like the PTA.

There must be some sort of a Federal clearing house, and my amendment is directed to maintaining Federal supervision, and enough for an actual match-

ing program, and to let additional money for the program be raised in the States. I do not see how any Member of Congress can say this should become a paternalistic, federally-supported program when there are surpluses in every State treasury. We have in my State, for instance, a balance of $430,000,000; you apparently have in the treasury of Alabama a current balance at the present time of $30,000,000; Mississippi has $22,000,000, and States which are spoken of as in great need have from $3,000,000 to $501,000,000. I say that California can well afford to pay the costs of this program in California out of its own funds. I know of nothing more important than the children of the United States of America.

To my mind, the needs of children, as future citizens of the United States, takes precedence over any other necessity to be paid from a State pocketbook. I think this should be a State-supported program and not by Federal payments. For that reason I offer the amendment which is now before you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment which will increase the amount of the school-lunch appropriation for fiscal 1948 from the $45,000,000 recommended by the committee to $75,000,000, and to eliminate the restricting proviso regarding the ability of the State to match the funds derived from the Federal Government with income from the school lunches themselves. We must give the first thought in this program to its maximum effectiveness and the second thought to the details of the business arrangements between the Federal Government and the States. I do not see that we have any right to harm the program because the business arrangements do not seem to the Committee appropriate but rather that every effort must be made to improve the arrangements so that they are suitable without impairing the program. We must not forget that the whole program is provided for by Public Law 396 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and I see no reason for departing from the principle approved by that act. Therefore, I will vote to appropriate the full amount the program required for the next fiscal year as set up in the budget—$75,000,000.

As I said at the time I fought for the deficiency appropriation for the school-lunch program for fiscal 1947:

> I consider the school-lunch program a part of the national responsibility for health. The program of a hot lunch for school children has met with the universal approval of mothers, teachers, educational authorities, and Parent-Teacher Associations. The cost is infinitesimal compared to the benefits. The health of the child determines the health of the man. I look forward to legislation which will be a national expression of the responsibility for the health of all citizens. The school-lunch program is an early and a necessary step.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 1½ minutes.



Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 52, line 23, strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$11,470,400."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, the National School Lunch Act, ever since it was first presented to us, has been replete with misrepresentation. Originally declared to be for the purpose, among other things, of encouraging the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, it was enacted at a time when food rationing still prevailed in this country and when millions of people throughout the world were starving. Even today when our fabulous exports of foodstuffs are depleting our own supplies and causing prices to rise proportionately, the Administrator of the School Lunch Program, in testifying recently before the subcommittee, made the outlandish statement on page 1151 of the hearings that the program had "provided one of the best possible outlets for nutritious farm products that might otherwise contribute to local or national food surpluses." Proof that this bureaucrat did not himself believe the statement I have just read is evidenced by his further statement two pages beyond in the hearings which reads:

> In the current year, with the exception of potatoes and a few other perishable commodities, surpluses suitable for the school-lunch program have been limited.

The fact is that schools have purchased food for the lunch program with complete freedom of action and in disregard of whether or not a particular commodity is surplus.

The height of misrepresentation, however, is in connection with State matching of Federal contributions. I am certain it was the impression of 95 percent of the Members of this House that this matching would be bona fide. Yet what do we find was the actual practice for the fiscal year 1947? The Federal Government will have expended $72,975,000. State and local governments appropriated but $11,470,400. The difference—and I submit that this is one of the most unconscionable acts of financial finagling which has ever come to my attention—was made up by the assumption that the pennies paid by the children for their lunches were a part of the State contribution. Then, for good measure, the States included as their contribution for matching purposes $25,000,000 of unaudited and unauditable "donations" from churches, parent-teachers' associations, service clubs, and so forth.

My amendment is for the purpose of reducing the Federal contribution to the amount actually appropriated for school lunches by the State and local governments during the fiscal year 1947.

I feel that even this sum is excessive in view of the fact that the Federal Government is some $260,000,000,000 in the red whereas at the end of the fiscal year 1946, there were surpluses in the treasuries of every State in the Union, as per the following figures published by the Bureau of the Census:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama | $30,000,000 |
| Arizona | 11,000,000 |
| Arkansas | 12,000,000 |
| California | 490,000,000 |
| Colorado | 22,000,000 |
| Connecticut | 29,000,000 |
| Delaware | 13,000,000 |
| Florida | 38,000,000 |
| Georgia | 15,000,000 |
| Idaho | 10,000,000 |
| Illinois | 188,000,000 |
| Indiana | 89,000,000 |
| Iowa | 49,000,000 |
| Kansas | 27,000,000 |
| Kentucky | 25,000,000 |
| Louisiana | 27,000,000 |
| Maine | 9,000,000 |
| Maryland | 33,000,000 |
| Massachusetts | 13,000,000 |
| Michigan | 84,000,000 |
| Minnesota | 29,000,000 |
| Mississippi | 22,000,000 |
| Missouri | 62,000,000 |
| Montana | 9,000,000 |
| Nebraska | 10,000,000 |
| Nevada | 5,000,000 |
| New Hampshire | 6,000,000 |
| New Jersey | 42,000,000 |
| New Mexico | 7,000,000 |
| New York | 501,000,000 |
| North Carolina | 98,000,000 |
| North Dakota | 17,000,000 |
| Ohio | 162,000,000 |
| Oklahoma | 26,000,000 |
| Oregon | 58,000,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 180,000,000 |
| Rhode Island | 6,000,000 |
| South Carolina | 18,000,000 |
| South Dakota | 15,000,000 |
| Tennessee | 32,000,000 |
| Texas | 55,000,000 |
| Utah | 3,000,000 |
| Vermont | 8,000,000 |
| Virginia | 74,000,000 |
| Washington | 90,000,000 |
| West Virginia | 22,000,000 |
| Wisconsin | 93,000,000 |
| Wyoming | 8,000,000 |

Thus there is not a single State in the Union which could not adequately finance its school-lunch program without any participation by the Federal Government.

In conclusion, I wish to address myself to the Members of the House who represent the States who will pay the bulk of the cost of any money spent by the Federal Government for the school-lunch program.

You Members from Massachusetts should know that your State will receive back in benefits but 43 cents of every dollar your taxpayers must pay into the Federal Government for the school-lunch program. For Connecticut taxpayers the figure is but 28 cents; for New York, 18 cents; for New Jersey, 50 cents; for Pennsylvania, 57 cents; for Ohio, 40 cents; for Indiana, 67 cents; for Illinois, 31 cents; for Michigan, 43 cents. This program short-changes your taxpayers. I hope you will all bear this fact in mind in your consideration of this appropriation.

(Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the parliamentary situation with respect to amendments that are pending? The time, of course, was closed on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does action occur now on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, immediately upon the presentation of the amendment I submitted a substitute which I sent to the desk. I took it for granted it had been read.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri be read now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CANNON:

Page 52, line 23, strike out "$45,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000."

Page 52, line 23, strike out the colon, insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 25.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand it, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri is not presently before the Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could not have been offered, otherwise it would be before the Committee at the present time. I want to be sure that the members of the Committee appreciate the parliamentary situation and the things on which we vote. My understanding is we vote first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] to reduce the amount from $45,000,000 to $11,470,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When that is disposed of, then the gentleman from Missouri will offer his substitute or amendment to modify the pending amendment, to raise it from $45,000,000 to $75,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be the last amendment voted on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if there is no more time desired, I should like to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. There are others on the list. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a moment ago told us how much he loved the little children of America, how important they are to the country, yet in the same breath he wants to take this money away from them. That just does not add up to me.

A few years ago the big tax burden that the people bore was by State and county taxes. Today the big tax burden is from taxes due the Federal Government. The States, the municipalities, the counties, and the various subdivisions of our country are not getting back in return the proper ratio of money that we are paying into the Federal Treasury. Our taxes are pyramiding. This program is a program which works as a return from our Federal tax dollars. It is a uniform program that provides nutritious lunches throughout the entire United States. We all know it has paid huge dividends. I want to go on record favoring the amendment by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to increase this appropriation to $75,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote from a statement issued by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, which I submit for the consideration of Congress with the hope that adequate funds will be provided for this necessary and worth while program. I feel that it would be neglect of our duty if we do not do so.

Today the number of school children who cannot go home to a nourishing meal at noon is multiplying rapidly. For example, children attending high schools or consolidated rural schools often cannot go home for lunch, the large areas served by these schools make for distances too great to be covered during the noon hour. Also, many mothers are either employed or for other reasons have no time to prepare and serve a nutritious lunch during their children's brief noontime recess. Moreover, children of the same family who attend different schools are seldom able to get home at the same time, and under these conditions lunch at home becomes a hurried, unsatisfactory arrangement. Finally, parents living in large cities frequently prefer their children to remain at school rather than face traffic hazards at the busy noon hour. Student and police patrols cannot be effectively operated during this brief midday interval. The war revealed that malnutrition is much more widespread than most of our people realized. It was found to be most prevalent among the low-economy groups, but many young people from families having good incomes and from farm homes having an abundance of food also showed dangerous dietary deficiencies. These could be attributed only to poor food habits, cold and unpalatable meals, and unbalanced diets. It is generally believed that if all school children were assured a nutritious and palatable meal at noon the health of the school children could be greatly improved and foundations laid for healthier adulthood.

The school-lunch program should be the answer to this, and has proven that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I can only make a very brief observation in the time allotted me. In that time I want to restate the facts that were cited by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], a few minutes ago. I want to point out to you that less than a month ago this Congress appropriated $350,000,000 with which to feed the so-called starving people of Europe, half of whom 3 years were running bayonets through good American bellies and yet you have only $45,000,000—less than one-seventh of that amount to spend on our own children.

I can show you undernourished children now down in the State of Mississippi. I can show them to you in Tennessee, in Arkansas, in Louisiana, and other places and I assure you they would be in a pretty bad fix if it were not for this school-lunch program. I think it would be criminal to refuse to restore the funds for this school-lunch program. If you vote to cut the funds any further for this item or if you leave it stand at only $45,000,000 you ought to go home and hang your head in shame.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, in its report on H. R. 3601 the Appropriations Committee stated they are reducing the budget of the school-lunch program from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000.

According to the provisions of Public Law 396 covering the school-lunch program, $10,000,000 was authorized to be set aside for nonfood items, which includes equipment. Thus, in effect, there will be but $35,000,000 left for food in the program.

If the recommendations of the committee are taken the result will be that States will have to do one of two things:

First. The States will have to choose the number of schools within the State that can be handled throughout the next school year, which in turn will mean that approximately only 35 percent of the presently participating schools will be included in the program.

Second. In the event the States choose to continue the program in all presently participating schools, it is estimated that the program will last only through the first half of next year.

I feel that either of these alternatives would be disastrous, and consequently urge that the House restore for the school-lunch program the seventy-five million requested.

Everyone familiar with the wonderful work done by this program should insist that this project be maintained in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because I am going to support the amendment for $75,000,000, but I want to say this in the short time allotted to me, that we have 26,000,000 bushels of Irish potatoes in excess of the needs of the country. I do not understand why a great committee like the Committee on Appropriations, interested in saving funds and saving food, I suppose, could not have worked out a prop-

osition whereby some of the 26,000,000 bushels of Irish potatoes that are spoiling and wasting in this country, and which cannot be sold at home and abroad, might not be given to some of these school children throughout the length and breadth of the United States. If we want to do a real service to the school children of the country as a whole we should make some arrangement whereby some of these funds can be used for the purpose of supplying the school children with food that otherwise would go to waste and spoil and rot in this country. I commend this thought to the gentleman from Illinois as a proposition of a humanitarian nature that he can work upon without expending any funds.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, in the reduction of the school-lunch program appropriation from the $75,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to the $45,000,000 recommended by the Appropriations Committee, the Republican majority in the House has hit the American school child a body blow where it would hurt most—his little stomach. It seems almost inconceivable that Republican economy should go so far. When we see the program of the Republican Party taking shape first in the form of big tax reductions for the higher brackets and penny reductions for the low-income groups, then in the threatened extension of excise taxes which would put the burden of reducing the national debt on those least able to pay, later in the reduction of the various appropriation bills, thereby throwing thousands of faithful Government employees with years of service out of work, and finally in this last economy move of curtailing school lunches, we are filled with well grounded fear for the future welfare of the country.

We have voted millions of dollars for the relief and rehabilitation of the countries of Europe, some of which were our enemies. But when it comes to taking care of the first line of defense of our own country—our own children—the Republican majority is apparently willing that they should go undernourished and underfed.

I have time after time heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle rant and rave about communism. Of course, it is a threat and a danger, but it is because of the program which I have referred to before that it will become a greater danger and a greater threat to this country. Hungry mouths will make Communists. That is the procedure that Russia is using to Sovietize the countries within its present sphere. That is the procedure that will make Communists in our own country. I hope that the House will adopt the Cannon amendment to increase the school-lunch appropriation to $75,000,000—it will be the humanitarian and patriotic thing to do.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in the usual steamroller fashion of this Congress the majority party has again limited debate on an important amendment. I wish to announce that I shall support the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] which seeks to increase the inadequate amount, $45,000,000, allowed by the Republican majority for the vitally necessary school-lunch program to the amount, $75,000,000, requested by President Truman and the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1948.

Less than a year ago Public Law 396 of the Seventy-ninth Congress which I supported was approved by President Truman and our school-lunch program became basic law. Now, less than a year later, at a time when we are spending billions of dollars for foreign relief, the Republican majority of this House scraps the law and denies a pitifully small sum needed for the most valuable assets we have, our American children. Mr. Chairman, I have all along supported our school-lunch program and I shall continue to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been before us on another occasion when we were asking for a deficiency appropriation, and I had something to say about it at that time, as well as other members did and I do not wish to belabor you nor to criticize you and to speak in terms of maudlin sympathy about the poor little children, and so on. But, as a matter of fact, my friends, the poor little children are involved.

I wish to address myself in this minute and a half that I have, which is very short, to the thought of the strength of our Nation. I am alarmed and worried about this great Nation of ours like you are. You are as honest and sincere and patriotic as I am; I am certain of that. But, all of us who are honest and sincere and patriotic American citizens are trying to look not to the next election but to the next generation, and I am thinking about the health of our Nation and the strength of our Nation, and I am telling you that there are very few things we can do to strengthen our Nation more, in my judgment, than to keep the school-lunch program going in a big way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM: "WE FEED THE GERMANS AND JAPS BUT NEGLECT OUR OWN MOST VALUABLE CROP—OUR CHILDREN"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I consider this action by the Committee on Appropriations the most outrageous of all the meat-ax slashes they have made.

Last session we passed a law, after long and careful consideration, to help supplement the diet of undernourished children. Now they come in and cut the appropriation and by that action virtually nullify the law.

Millions have been appropriated for the relief of hungry and needy people of other countries. For the terrible Turks and for the Greeks you have appropriated more millions, not alone to feed and clothe them to provide them with arms and munitions.

MONEY TO HELP PRODUCE RECORD CROP—BUT NOT FOR CHILDREN

We have appropriated more millions on millions—and you have voted for those appropriations—to provide fertilizer and soil conservation programs to help the farmers produce record crops; but for the most valuable crop of all, our children, the future citizens, yes, and soldiers, of America, you are providing a niggardly sum, grudgingly and disparagingly.

Yes, you have voted for appropriations to save the cattle, to guard against foot-and-mouth disease, to feed wild ducks—but to feed needy children of our own, American children, you have cut down the already too small budget by $30,000,000.

My colleague, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has told you that only 1 out of 10 of the school children obtains the free lunch available under this grant. Let his figures be correct; yet I still say to you that that means we can make it possible for 750,000 school kids to be happy with a hot midday meal, to be better students and better junior citizens, and to grow up to be better and stronger and healthier adults.

He has told you that in Chevy Chase the children all buy their own lunches and pay the regular full price; but he neglected to tell you that Chevy Chase is perhaps the wealthiest community in Greater Washington.

THIS ECONOMY IS A CHEAT ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

I have voted for all measures designed to help the American farmer to raise his income, his standards of living, and these wonderful record-breaking crops of which we all have been so proud.

No one has begrudged those funds.

But now for the benefit of children who otherwise might not be able to eat a lunch at all, or at best would have a scrap of bread or a cold boiled egg, I surmise that all of you will vote for this paltry sum on the pretext of economy.

What a cheat you are giving the American people.

You have just passed a bill reducing the tax bill of the wealthy by $3,000,000,000. Is this the way you will make it up—by taking even the lunches away from poor, defenseless urchins?

FOLLOWING DICTATES OF PARTY LEADER

In all this you are, I presume, following the advice of your real party leader, former President Hoover, for he testified before a House committee only a few days ago that he is in favor of feeding the Japanese and the Germans, though we still have not started to bring back the bodies of our 300,000 dead, and our hospitals still are overcrowded with the maimed from the war of resistance against their aggressions. I suppose this is on the theory that we started the war against the Nazis and the Japs.

I well remember that it was this same President Hoover who prevented money appropriated for the relief of starving cattle from being used for the relief of starving people when it appeared the cattle would live without it.

It is easy to understand that his heart would bleed for our defeated enemies but not for our own underprivileged children, who may be the next victims of those enemies when they have been rehabilitated.

You have done everything possible to encourage the high prices which makes it harder and harder for underpaid parents to feed their children, with the cost of bread and milk nearly doubled; but you will not do this little bit to make up for that.

The American people will not soon forget this triumph of selfishness over humanity.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, I should like to speak to you briefly and informally.

A matter of great importance which I would like to refer to is the school-lunch program about which my fellow Carolinian has spoken to you. I am very much interested in public affairs now, and I have been for a quarter of a century. I have been in public affairs for that length of time.

I can truthfully say that I know of nothing for which public moneys are expended from which we receive so much value as the school-lunch program.

In my State, of necessity, we have had to consolidate many schools. I would like to point out, too, that in spite of the report about the poor schools in the South, I do not know any that spends more per capita than the State of South Carolina.

I might add that that assumption as to the state of the schools in the South is now entirely justified. Lately I saw statistics to prove my statement above. South Carolina is carrying a greater load than any other State in an effort to meet its school problems.

Very often children are required to travel 40 and 50 miles to school in our State by way of bus. I remember when we had the controversy about daylight-saving time.

I have seen children in the first grade standing on the highway at the break of dawn, and frequently standing in the chill of the early morning hours, waiting to be transported 40 or 50 miles to school.

I have children in my own home and I know that they get up in haste and confusion, and they frequently do not feel like eating breakfast. As a result, they go away to school, and if they are not provided a hot lunch during the midday, they do not have any warm food until they reach home at the close of day.

I cannot too strongly endorse the school-lunch program.

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this cut in appropriations in the funds for our school-lunch program. In the past weeks we have seen this House vote for millions of dollars to feed the hungry of Europe and I have no quarrel with that program but we should remember that charity begins at home. Why should we not look after the underprivileged of our own States. The records show that millions of our young men were rejected by our armed forces due to the lack of proper nourishment while they were growing into manhood. Let this House forget political promises and campaign talk when it comes to feeding the children of our country.

We can go along with the Republicans on their economy drive in many instances but let us not bring such questions into this argument.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed and dismayed by the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] to reduce the child-lunch appropriation to $11,000,000 and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to reduce it to $25,000,000. I am convinced that the $45,000,000 appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Committee is not enough and consequently I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to increase that amount to $75,000,000.

I must compliment the Republicans for the well-organized steam roller they have used throughout this session and in the consideration of this bill to take away from the American people and the American children the help and the assistance which the Government should rightly give to them. The result has been that organization has triumphed over consideration of our people's needs and the steam-roller has functioned at the expense of specific Government obligations and duties in behalf of people who need our assistance.

I am amazed at the callousness of the opposition to the school-lunch program. We can appropriate millions to relieve the distress of people overseas, but we find it difficult to look after our own. I have received scores of letters and telegrams in behalf of the school lunch program and, as a consistent supporter of it, I will continue to give it my full support. I hope the House will vote to increase the amount for the school lunch program because we will be investing our money in our greatest national asset—our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, last year on the 6th day of June the Congress of the United States passed this act:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods, by providing an adequate supply—

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we will not bypass that word "adequate." If we intended to hold out to the people of this country that we recognize the value of this program and that we propose to enter into an agreement with the several States to furnish an adequate supply of foods for the school children of this country, we ought to stand by it now. With all due respect, I suggest to the members of this committee that it is mockery to make this amount less than $75,000,000. Let us be sincere in this matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to raise the appropriation for school lunches to $75,000,000 instead of the sum of $45,000,000 now in the bill. I expressed myself on this matter in general debate yesterday and I cannot say much in the short time now allotted.

This school lunch has been written into our statutory law. The law authorizes $75,000,000 as the Federal contribution to the joint State-Federal program. I am supporting this amendment to appropriate the full amount authorized by law.

No one knows better than I do the trials and tribulations of a boy being reared under hard financial circumstances. I have known what it means to be hungry. We have many American children now who know what that means. I consider, Mr. Chairman, that this school-lunch program, this provision to give a school lunch to children standing in need of it, is a program to strengthen America and make our future citizens not only strong physically but strong mentally. We want to build and keep America strong and certainly this school lunch is a very effective way to do it.

I cannot too strongly urge the adoption of the Cannon amendment and thus insure to the American children a continuance of this program. I make this appeal in behalf of the children of America. Stand by them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, of all the puzzling matters that face the

American people today, I think there is more confusion and more indignation on the part of the population generally concerning the acts of our Government in regard to this one thing; that is, that we are voting millions and billions of dollars to aid the people in the war-stricken countries and even the enemy countries and doing so little relatively for our own people. The majority are acting in the name of economy. I am willing to see work done in other parts of the world to rehabilitate those devastated lands, but I hate to see a refusal on the part of our own Government to do likewise for our own sections of the country. I am willing to clothe and feed the people of the world but we must not neglect our own, and we are doing it in this Agriculture appropriation bill just as the House did in the Interior appropriation bill some weeks ago.

When the school-lunch program had its origin the idea may have been to accomplish two things at once, to distribute surplus agricultural products of food and at the same time to benefit the school children by this nutritional program. It may be that the first objective is no longer needed, but who can tell when it may be needed. I, too, have heard a great deal of complaint about spring potatoes being destroyed, and I also think it is a shame. Of course I know that new potatoes may be of such a perishable character as to make them entirely unsuited for shipment abroad to starving people. But that does not necessarily prevent the use of such food for American children. The other great value of the school-lunch program continues to exist.

With so many millions of our young men disqualified for military service in the war because of lack of nutrition in childhood, it ought to be a warning that the very safety of our Nation depends upon the good health of our boys and girls. Even if we no longer need a market for surplus food in school lunches, the other need is all-compelling, and we are short-sighted indeed if we do not exercise great generosity in implementing the program with suitable funds. I know what school lunches mean in the far Southwest, and I know that even in the best of farming communities many children are suffering from malnutrition. Liberal support and scientific management in this work will repay the Nation and the future great dividends. A saving here is expensive.

[Mr. ROBSION addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise now merely to point out the implications that are contained in all these amendments. There are 50,000 schools having school lunches and receiving Federal aid today. There are over 200,000 schools in the United States. On that ratio, you can, by multiplying the amounts by four times find the implied responsibility this Congress is assuming under these amendments. Under the Buck amendment calling for $11,000,000, eventually, if all the schools participate, it will be approximately $45,000,000.

Under the Phillips formula it will be $100,000,000. Under the committee amendment which I support it will be $180,000,000, eventually, if all schools participate, or four times the amount in the bill which services 50,000 of our 200,000 schools. Under the Cannon amendment it will be $300,000,000.

I want the committee to have the full importance of all that is implied in these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

(Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I supported the school-lunch program heretofore. I am for it now. I feel that some of my friends who want to economize on the children of America and who talk about inefficiency and waste are among those who have voted repeatedly to give billions of dollars to foreign nations, much of it for waste and extravagance. I feel the time has come when we should look after our own people. Charity still begins at home.

Mr. Chairman, to cut the budget estimates 32 percent in the appropriations for the Agriculture Department is not justifiable. It is true that there are duplications that should be eliminated. It is equally true that there are some cuts that should be made. But such cuts should not be made on wealth-producing projects such as the REA, soil conservation, and land-purchase projects for veterans and others. These and others are wealth-producing and not wealth-consuming projects.

I know that the Appropriations Committee claims that the REA has more money than it can spend. That may be true in some localities, but not in others. In my own State only 1 farmer out of 10 has electricity in his home. Modern facilities demand that these farmers, who help feed the Nation, be given some of the conveniences enjoyed by city people. Modern civilization and full production demand that the REA be extended to every farm in this Nation where it is at all practicable. This cannot be done by cutting the REA appropriations.

The REA has a backlog of applications now totaling $240,000,000. The REA estimates this figure will be $270,000,000 by July 1 against which it will have only $10,000,000 in unallotted funds. In other words, it would take $260,000,000 to break even on July 1—without any money to cover new applications through 1948.

The truth is that in place of cutting REA loans $25,000,000, the budget estimate, the committee, realizing the great benefit of REA, should have increased it. If the REA was to accept all of the applications, and extend the benefits of the REA to all the applicants, it would take $361,000,000 by June 30, 1948. I feel that at least the $25,000,000 should be reinstated.

I also feel that the 28½ percent cut in administration funds will mean 25 percent fewer farm people who will receive electricity in 1948 than if the cuts were not made. I feel that at least part of these administration funds should be restored. A 28½ percent cut is too severe.

The committee argues that the REA co-ops, when once set up, are capable of running their own business without Federal supervision. In this way they feel that the expense can be cut. I do believe in local self-government but the committee forgets that the REA is still a very young institution, and that its activities are still expanding. This is especially true in North Dakota and other States like North Dakota. I shall, therefore, vote to restore the budget estimate in the appropriation when that amendment is offered.

Next we come to soil conservation. Here again we have not only a wealth-producing project, but a wealth-saving project. A project that prevents depletion of our soil. A project that prevents erosion, and the dust bowls. Here again the committee argues that the program is completed. Yet the program has but started. Surely to severely cut the estimates in this appropriation is a mistake.

This is especially true when we consider the foreign commitments, the commitments such as the $3,750,000,000 gift to Great Britain, the $750,000,000 gifts made recently and the $27,000,000,000 that we have at present committed ourselves to, but that I am satisfied another administration and another Congress will repudiate.

However, be that as it may, if we are to continue to fulfill these commitments in any degree at all, we will have to conserve our soil. We will have to prevent soil depletion, erosion, and dust bowls. I shall, therefore, vote for and support the restoration of the budget estimates for soil conservation.

I am proud that I voted against the gag rule that was adopted yesterday. That gag rule permits the Appropriations Committee to write the Nation's laws. It virtually sets it up not only as an appropriation committee, but as a legislative committee. I feel that that gag rule, the same as gag rules under previous Congresses, is an insult to the Members of Congress.

I realize that first we gag ourselves, and then say we cannot do anything because we were gagged. I am sorry that so many of my friends yesterday voted for the gag rule. Party regularity must cease when the Nation's welfare is at stake, when the problems of agriculture are at stake. These are not party issues; they are American issues.

Under the gag rule, which we adopted yesterday, Members are prohibited from raising points of order. This rule was expressly adopted—deliberately adopted—to permit the Appropriations Committee to change laws as well as to make appropriations.

Under the 1935 law there was a permanent appropriation for agriculture of a sum equal to 30 percent of custom-duty receipts. This amounted to about $148,000,000 each year. Under the law this was used by the Department of

Agriculture to steady the market of surplus commodities.

A point of order could have been made against this on the grounds that it is legislation in an appropriation bill, but the gag rule prohibits this. It waives all points of order. I shall assist and do all I can to have that legislative provision stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROHRBOUGH].

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I do that because I am interested in young people. We have been having reports that there is a wave of juvenile delinquency. It is mighty hard for young people to be good when they are hungry. I do not know whether or not as we grow older we forget how much it means to youngsters, to small boys and small girls, to have enough to eat.

We are commanded to hunger and thirst after righteousness, but I tell you that the people who are hungry physically cannot hunger and thirst after righteousness. They cannot be good. So, I support the amendment to prevent malnutrition and to promote better citizenship.

[Mr. POTTS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the school-lunch program is primarily a measure of agricultural stabilization. It is only incidentally a child-feeding program. The sum that will tend best to stabilize the agricultural program of our country is the sum we should support. In my opinion that sum is seventy-five million.

While some States may be prepared to take over the child-feeding portion of the program, other States are not.

My district is primarily an industrial district. But I recognize the complete interdependence of industrial and agricultural communities. A crippling blow to the stability of agriculture is a crippling blow to American industry and vice versa.

It is poor economy to cut the school-lunch figure when that cut is a blow to agricultural stability.

Furthermore, how can we justify crippling the child-feeding feature of the program? Which schools do we wish to strike out? On what particular children do you wish the ax to fall?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to a number of provisions in H. R. 3601 and hope that they will be corrected by proper amendment. The over-all cut of 32 percent in the appropriation for the Agriculture Department, as set forth in H. R. 3601, is entirely too severe and deprives the Agriculture Department and the farmers of many needed services to which the farmers are entitled and which are necessary to preserve their present prosperous economy. These cuts affect not only the farm program, but the living conditions and welfare of the farm population throughout the Nation.

I am especially opposed to the provision which reduces the allowance for the school-lunch program from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. The program was eliminated by the House deficiency bill for 1947, but was reinstated by amendment over the objection of the Republican leadership. Now after this was done, this bill reduces this much-needed appropriation from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000 for 1948. In my opinion, this reduction is absolutely unjustified and is a step backward in the farm life of our Nation. It comes at the very time when this much-needed program was expected to be a permanent set-up and a great advantage in promoting not only the education, but the health of the children of our Nation. It is a disappointment to everyone concerned in this splendid program because it was expected that the program would be expanded rather than abandoned.

We have not time to enumerate the many advantages of the school-lunchroom program or the benefit that the children of the Nation derive from the program. These are demonstrated by the expansion and growing popularity of the program.

The declaration of the policy contained in the act of the Seventy-ninth Congress is as follows: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural products and other food, by assisting the States through grants and aid and other means in providing an adequate supply of food and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance and operation and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs." In initiating, supporting and maintaining the national school-lunchroom program, the Government of the United States has rendered invaluable aid to the cause of public education and to public health in all of the States of the Union and it seems a tragedy to cut it out when it probably is just entering upon a period of its greatest use to public education.

The very able and progressive superintendent of public instruction in North Carolina, Dr. Clyde Erwin, has urged me and the other members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress to support the program and to urgently request the Appropriations Committee of the House not to desert this important needed legislation which contributes immeasurably to the health and education of the children of the United States. I am informed that the education leaders of many of the States of the Union have written similar letters to their Congressmen urging that this program be supported to the limit.

I hope the Cannon amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a letter received from Mr. W. D. Reynolds, county agent of Mecklenburg County, Charlotte, N. C., giving a very intelligent picture of conditions of agricultural life and future prospects of agriculture in the United States provided that the agriculture program is not cut in such a severe way as to handicap, if not destroy the farm program which has proven so successful and has made the farmers prosperous for the first time in the history of our Nation:

OFFICE OF COUNTY FARM AGENT,
*Mecklenburg County, Charlotte, N. C.*

Hon. HAMILTON C. JONES,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: I understand there is a bill being considered by the Agricultural Committee of the United States Congress to reduce the appropriations for agriculture. First, let me suggest to you that in my humble opinion farm people of America have made more progress during the last 15 years than anytime in history, and I sincerely believe that one of the big factors causing this splendid progress has been the far-sighted leaders in our Federal Government, the Congressmen, Senators, and others. To me, it would be no less than a tragedy now to hamper this progressive segment of society by reducing the appropriations of the Federal Government to such a point that our agricultural agencies would not be able to render to the farm people the same good services they have become accustomed to during the past few years. Let me hasten to assure you that it is my humble opinion that the farmers have never had more than their share of the appropriations made by our good Congress, and I further believe that the money appropriated has been spent wisely.

As I travel over the county and State and talk to farm people, I am almost daily reminded that this farm or that farm was an old run-down, washed away farm 15 or 20 years ago. But, today we find the soil being reclaimed and rebuilt through the help of the agricultural agencies. I am particularly thinking of the terracing program and soil building, the farmers being encouraged to plant cover crops, pastures and forest trees on certain spots or fields, and then too, the material such as lime, acid and potash that the farmers have been educated to use. Through the help of the Agricultural Department they have been encouraged to use these better practices in a number of cases by certain allowances made to them by our good Government.

It is an uphill road when we go out and talk to farmers about the needs of their soil and they explain to us in all too many cases that they do not have the wherewith to finance the project, but when the Government lends encouragement by supplying certain materials, the road is made easier and progress is much faster.

Now, we have heard some discussion about the over-lapping of certain agencies, but in my humble opinion that is merely a mole hill and it has been developed into a mountain by people who do not know how the different agencies plan and work together. Certainly, that is true of our country and there is no reason why that could not be true in every county in the United States. The county agent's program is purely an educational program while the Triple A for instance cooperates by furnishing some of these materials that we have spoken of, which certainly helps to make for a better rural condition. Let me assure you that the farm people are asking no special favors, but they do feel that they are entitled to their fair share of Federal help, and it is useless for me to tell you that unless we continue to encourage the farm people to use better practices in preserving their soil when cultivating their crops and in fact in using better agricultural practices in both field crops and livestock, America stands to lose much. In fact, the whole world will be affected. We must give to the farm boy the same opportunity that business and other professions offer.

Your continued interest in our farm people will not be forgotten by those who till the soil.

Yours truly,

W. D. REYNOLDS,
*County Farm Agent.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let us get the parliamentary situation ironed out. The bill as reported by the subcommittee contains $45,000,000 for school lunches with the proviso that the money paid by children for lunches shall not be considered for matching purposes.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] offers an amendment to reduce the amount to $25,000,000.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] offers a substitute amendment to reduce the amount to $11,470,000.

When it is in order, the gentleman from Missouri will offer to make it $75,000,000, which was the budget request.

Let us see where we are on this thing and notwithstanding, I hope you will pardon me when I say it, but it is the only adjective I can think of, some of the mawkish sentiment that has been expressed here, as a matter of fact, if we did not offer anything in this bill, there would still be $160,000,000 for school lunches. Secondly, let us make it clear that this is not a free lunch. When the deficiency appropriation bill was here for $6,000,000 recently, the welkin resounded in the well of this House with talk of free lunch. Let us see what Dr. Ockley said. Here is his testimony: "One out of every nine children gets a free lunch."

I asked him that, and he said, "Yes, sir." He said, "One in nine is free, and eight out of nine pay the full amount. The ninth child gets a ticket."

Now, then, they can go right on with their school-lunch program, even if the Federal Government did not contribute a nickel to this.

You talk about potatoes and about surplus. This is a cash program. When this money is made available the Department sets it up on a quartely basis and the cash is allocated to the various States. Do they have to buy surplus potatoes with it? No. They do not. Do they have to buy any food that is in aboundance? Read the testimony. The Department says they do not have to buy any surplus supplies. We have no control over them. It is a nutrition program, on a cash subsidy basis. That accounts for the fact that we cannot order them around and tell them what to do on this thing, without writing a lot of provisions and provisos in here that are impossible. Now, that is the whole story.

The logical amendment is the one offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], because if you are going to match direct appropriations by States and counties, it is $11,400,000. So he proposes to match it. That is the law. If you want to include nonfood assistance, then you take the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, because that would be a little more than direct matching, plus the $10,000,000 for nonfood assistance. Now, why $45,000,000 in the bill? First, we match the direct appropriations. Secondly, we include the nonfood assistance, and that is $10,000,000. Then we give credit to all donations and contributions by churches, by luncheon clubs, whether they are offered in kind or cash or in materials or what. So I thought we were extremely generous in the subcommittee in making it $45,000,000. However, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has offered the logical amendment, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], who has given special study to it and who is a member of the subcommittee, has included, no doubt, the nonfood assistance, and reduced it from $45,000,000 to $25,000,000.

So that is the story. Then, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will come along and ask you to approve $75,000,000.

Let me conclude by saying that only 25 percent of the Nation's schools are being fed through this program today. If you want to carry it out logically, make up your mind, according to the testimony before the committee, that this will cost the Federal Government somewhere between $350,000,000 and $600,000,000 a year. There is going to be an end to it, but the children will be fed just the same.

One other thing. Out in Chevy Chase they have a school and they serve hot lunches. Mr. HORAN's wife goes there three times a week to that school to help serve. They pay 25 cents for the lunch. They get no Federal help. They have $600 in the school treasury. They can buy playground equipment if they want to. However, if you go into the Federal program, all the money must go into the program and there will be no opportunity to use it for playground equipment. The children will still be fed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

All time for debate has expired.

The question comes first on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The substitute was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. CANNON to the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

On page 52, line 23, strike out "$45,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000."

On page 52, line 23, strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The question comes on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 155.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have that amendment reread?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the Phillips amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 85, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks after the reading of line 10, page 52 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 53, line 6, strike out "525,300" and insert "$725,300."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention, please, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and presumably those other members of the subcommittee who might be on the conference committee between this House and the other body.

I am introducing this amendment so that it will be in the RECORD, and the discussion will appear in the RECORD at this point. This item, on page 53, appearing as $525,300, is the amount of money appropriated by the subcommittee for the administration of the marketing acts. Heretofore this money has been taken from the administrative percentage of the section 32 funds. When representatives of the Department of Agriculture came to the subcommittee this year and asked for an appropriation, they set no amount, expecting that it would be taken from section 32 funds. The subcommittee appropriated exactly the same amount that was used in fiscal year 1947, thinking we were appropriating all that the Department wanted.

It is my belief that a part of the section 32 funds will be released. Immediately the administrative percentage will apply, and those funds may then be used for the item which now appears on page 53. I am therefore putting in a figure of $725,300, which I believe will be the amount needed. I am suggesting that when it goes to the other body, the committee there will probably remove this item entirely from this position in the bill and will apply it against the administrative percentage of section 32 funds.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD, and that I may now withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, $1,520,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 53, line 19, strike out "$1,520,000" and insert "$1,527,500."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amount involved is $7,500 for a marketing news reporter for dairy products in the Cleveland area. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Has it been approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; unfortunately it has not. I had not hoped it would be necessary to take the time of the Committee to discuss it, but I shall do so. A very gracious and charming Member of this great deliberative assembly, the gentlewoman from the State of Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke to me about this little matter quite some time before the committee concluded its reports. They have a marketing news reporter for dairy products at a number of places, including Atlanta, Detroit, St. Louis, and elsewhere, and it was felt there was a great need for the installation of two people in existing office facilities at a cost of $7,500 for this service. I think it is richly deserved, so I promised the lady that I would bring it to the attention of the committee. It has had the approval of the subcommittee, and I hope the House will do this good turn for a very charming and very competent Member of this body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I realize it is a lack of gallantry, Mr. Chairman, to oppose any proposition from the Member's district, and I fully concur with what the gentleman from Illinois has said about her charming personality. I am very anxious to go along, but this bill is part of a project to cut the President's budget $6,000,000,000, and now instead of cutting the budget we are even going above the budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might say to my very genial friend from Missouri that we could set up 1,000 offices or an equivalent amount for the amendment he offered a few months ago.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, but we could feed 7,000,000 children and perhaps that is a little more important than a marketing service. The Department has not recommended the expenditure, at least we have had no official notice of it, the Budget Bureau does not approve of it, so, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained reluctantly to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans under title II, $60,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 58, strike out all of line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Loans: Title I and section 43, $25,000,000; title II, $60,000,000; in all for loans, $85,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 15 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will reserve the right to object unless the next to the last 5 minutes is reserved for that side of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously the chairman of the committee cannot agree to that. After all, this is an amendment that departs from the committee action.

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean of the last 10 minutes, 5 are to be reserved for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman that that motion is subject to a point of order since there has been no debate on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. Since no debate has ensued, I withdraw my motion for the moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can submit a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want to encumber the gentleman from Mississippi further.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this provision of the bill does not represent the considered action of the Republican majority members of the committee. This committee met for eight long weeks, and at the conclusion of the hearings, after hearing innumerable witnesses, the bill was marked up. After 8 weeks of tedious testimony, in many cases the committee met and marked up the bill. The Republican majority members of the committee subscribed to the amendment which is on the Clerk's desk. Ten days after that happened and 10 days after the clerks had filed the reports and the hearings had been printed, the Republican steering committee met on Monday a week ago. The next day the committee was called back, and then the majority members of the committee reopened this case and struck out the $25,000,000 for the farm-tenant-purchase loan.

In doing that action, which was after the committee had concluded its consideration of the matter, they said to the American veterans, 49,000 of them who made application for the purchase of land under the farm-tenant-purchase program, "You will be cut off and denied the privileges that have been given to other citizens during the time that you were in the service."

I know the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, as smooth and suave as he is, is going to say that land prices are high and it will add to inflation. That is not what they said to those boys when they were out on the battlefronts fighting for their country.

I say to you, under Judge Tarver's chairmanship they carried a provision which protected any purchaser in that the Farm Security could not approve the purchase of a single piece of land unless it was at a reasonable price. Thus, this group on the Republican side who earlier subscribed to this program only had to write such protective language into this bill.

I would like to call attention to the fact further that by striking out that provision for future loans they are striking out the 35,000 applications by the veterans which are in process of being approved. When you go back to your respective districts, I am sure you will have an answer for this.

But as I was saying a while ago, when you were acting on the AAA amendment I had a friend from my State who was defeated for reelection to Congress some years ago. He told me later, "Everything that the people were sore at me about I had perfect defense for, but the trouble was they would not listen to me." Gentlemen, you may have a technical excuse, such as the demands of your party leaders to cut out this program of farm-tenant purchase. You may have a call on you to cut out AAA payments which you guaranteed last year by your action, but I am saying to you that when you break faith with your people back home in your districts you had better send for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and some of your Republican leaders because you are likely to need them. I am just afraid your people back home would not listen to them at that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the gentleman from Illinois, but under the rules of the House on a motion to limit debate may not include assignment of the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my previous motion and now move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

TENANT PURCHASE FUNDS ARE BEING REPAID; LOANS NECESSARY TO CONTINUE IMPORTANT SERVICE FOR FARM VETERANS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members understood this amendment and the conditions that pertain to the farm tenancy program, I believe this amendment would be agreed to.

For example, there are 72,000 acres that belong to the United States Government being liquidated under the Tarver amendment. None of that land can be sold unless there is a provision by which the purchasers, who must be veterans, can make loans. Unless provision is made for the extension of loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act, that land cannot be sold—72,000 acres of it.

The gentleman's amendment provides for $25,000,000. The Administrator tells me that 60 percent of all of current loans are going to veterans of the Second World War. That means that $15,000,000 would be virtually earmarked for them.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's position is further enforced by the fact that the members of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] have confidence in Mr. Lasseter, who is head of the Administration, and we can be sure that if he cannot loan this money advantageously, it will remain in the United States Treasury.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly. Mr. DIRKSEN's comments evidenced that in the record—his praise of Mr. Lasseter's forthright handling of this program.

Now, here is an opportunity for us, without breaching the economy policy, to provide for several hundred or perhaps several thousand veterans who want land. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] told us that 49,000 of them have applications on file. This is not a breach of the economy policy. This money is being paid back. The Government has loaned $282,000,000 under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and only $50,000 of that is considered lost.

Moreover, we are not adding to the inflationary influence. Let me make that clear. There is a reason for asserting that. The reason is that under the provisions of the law we passed last year it is sold to veterans, not at its present market value, which is an inflated value, but at its earning capacity value.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand if we do not approve this amendment that the bill which the gentleman introduced and which the Congress passed last year will be ineffective?

Mr. HAYS. It would be of no effect whatever as to these remaining farms because the loan procedure could not be used. We told the veterans at that time that we were going to take the rehabilitation project land and earmark it for them. In addition we have 3,000,000 acres land that the War Assets Administration will certify as surplus property for sale, some of which will be available for purchase by farm veterans. The Farm Credit Administration has 300,000 acres by transfer from War Assets that will be for sale. We should sell it at its earning capacity value and in family size units to veterans of the Second World War.

Altogether we have loaned to 44,000 farmers money with which to acquire title to land under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and 7,000 of them have already paid out in full, although, as I pointed out yesterday, they are 40-year loans. This is not an appropriation of $25,000,000. It is the earmarking of a loan fund, practically every dollar of which will be paid back.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I think the gentleman has probably answered my question, but is not this program working out advantageously in dollars and cents?

Mr. HAYS. Exactly. Thousands are repaying the debt in advance of the due date. Now, I do not want to hit below the belt. I know none of the Members of this House want to be unfair to the veterans. I have not indicated that any of you are unfair, but as a business proposition, to help some of the 650,000 who once said on an Army questionnaire that they wanted to go back to the land, we ought to continue this service. This is not an emotional appeal. It is good business. The Bankhead-Jones program is working out.

Let us take the $25,000,000 and, as contemplated by FHA, devote $15,000,000 of it to veterans of World War II who are filing these applications by the thousands. Let us put the emphasis on this farm program rather than on the regular veteran farm loans under the GI bill of rights, where we are really adding to the inflationary pressures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the gentleman from Arkansas, this is not a gift. It is a loan and a sound investment of Government funds. There is not a single good reason why we should deny this Government aid to the underprivileged farmers of American, and especially to our veterans who cannot obtain the necessary assistance from other sources.

I know that my very persuasive and artful friend from Illinois will try to hang this thing around the President's neck. He will blame President Truman for the destruction of the tenant-purchase program, merely because President Truman indicated to the Secretary of Agriculture the desirability of a conference looking toward the prevention of inflation of farm-land values. After the President wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, the letter to which I have heretofore called your attention, the gentleman from Illinois held another star chamber session and without hearings of any kind, but under the lash of his party leadership, struck this $25,000,000 from the bill and abruptly ended the tenant-purchase program. I invite the gentleman's attention again to the letter from Secretary Anderson, which I read this morning, in which he stated definitely that he had conferred with the President and that the President assured him definitely that he did not intend for his letter to have such disastrous and devastating effect upon this very worthwhile program. When I knew that the gentleman from Illinois would attempt to hold the President responsible for the action taken by his committee, I communicated with the Secretary of Agriculture and also with the White House, in an effort to ascertain the President's views with reference to the tenant-purchase program. I realized, of course, that the President was at the bedside of his mother, but appreciating the importance of the matter and believing that I knew the President's views, I insisted that he be advised as to the interpretation being placed upon his communication to the Secretary of Agriculture. The President, within the last 48 hours, was advised of the interpretation being placed upon his communication, and the letter from Secretary Anderson, which I read this morning, explains the President's position.

I know that this program cannot possibly be continued without the support of at least some of the Republicans in this House. May I remind you of the fact that the Farmers Home Administration bill was written by both Republicans and Democrats. My recollection is that it passed the House unanimously only a short year ago. It was recognized then as a sound program. Since its approval it has been managed properly by a man who has made an excellent record. I beg you Republicans to reconsider the action of your committee. Why should we single out veterans from the rural sections of America and attempt to economize by depriving them of the benefits of legislation which we so recently enacted in their behalf. You say you are trying to protect veterans from the evils of inflation. If you are so interested in veterans, why not protect all of them from the evils of inflation? Why not accord the same treatment to the veterans who live in the city? All of this talk about inflation is nothing but a lot of ballyhoo and nonsense and a desperate effort on your part to cover up the real purposes you have in mind. Loans which have recently been made by the Farmers Home Administration have averaged slightly more than loans made in the previous year. The Secretary's letter to me indicates an increase of only $3 a farm. Suppose the average loan has been somewhat higher than in the previous year, that does not necessarily mean inflation, because there has been a general rise in prices of everything. All of this talk about inflation is just an afterthought. If we have inflation now, certainly we had it 30 days ago, and at the time when this very able and distinguished subcommittee first reported this measure.

I take great pride in the successful operation of this Agency. During the last 12 months the Agency has been careful and cautious in making loans. I have not heard of a single unusually large loan being made anywhere in the country. All of the loans have been small

loans to finance the purchase of family-size farms. Certainly both parties should take pride in the record which has been established since Congress authorized the creation of the Farmers Home Administration.

I stated earlier in the day that veterans' organizations were in favor of the tenant-purchase program. At the Forty-seventh Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which was held September 4, 1946, the following resolution was adopted:

*Be it resolved by the Forty-seventh Annual Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States,* That the national legislative committee be authorized to take such action as it deems appropriate to insure that adequate Federal appropriations are available to provide the credit, guidance, and other services required by farm veterans; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the national legislative committee also inquire into the adequacy of the legislation affecting veterans as family-type farmers, and to the extent that it fails to meet the needs of farm veterans so advise the Congress and the various agencies and departments of the Government that are involved, and support specific legislation affecting the welfare of veterans as family-type farmers as may come before the Congress from time to time.

On February 16, 1947, the following resolution was adopted by AMVETS national executive committee:

Whereas a definite service can be rendered by assisting veterans of World War II who desire to become farmers and there is need for representation by Amvets in the making of policies affecting agriculture: Now therefore be it

*Resolved,* That a national agriculture committee of American Veterans of World War II be created to further the interests of veterans who are engaged in agriculture, such as:

1. Assistance to veterans in their efforts to purchase and to become established on farms.
2. Further extension of rural electrification power lines.
3. Improved farm-to-market roads.
4. Better rural health facilities.
5. Improved rural educational facilities; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this committee consist of seven members to represent the various phases of agriculture throughout the Nation and to be selected on the basis of training and experience in agricultural problems. This committee shall be composed of a chairman and a member from each of the six Amvets districts, the district members of the committee to be selected by the respective district vice commanders and the chairman to be appointed by the national commander and to serve during the administration of the national commander.

Moved by William Kipp, of Illinois. Seconded by Joseph Crespi, of Georgia. Adopted by unanimous vote of national executive committee.

The agricultural policy of the American Legion as expressed May 16, 1946, is in the following language:

Veterans are coming back to farming at a time when good farms and farming equipment are both hard to find and expensive to buy. During the years they were in the service, they missed their chance to benefit by the good yields and high prices of the wartime period. By every rule—economic necessity, law, and sentiment—the veteran farmer has first call upon opportunities in the field of American agriculture.

The American Legion, however, realizes that in many instances the interests of the veterans are best served by the furtherance of a program benefitting the entire agricultural population.

Therefore, the Legion supports a program for all farmers and asks only that veterans receive preference in obtaining the basic farm needs.

It shall be the policy of the American Legion to endorse and encourage adequate programs to make available: (1) family-size, sound, economic farm units, (2) short and long-term credit at low interest rates, (3) farm stock, machinery, and equipment, (4) farm housing facilities—and it shall further be the policy of the American Legion that veterans shall have definite preference in acquiring the benefits of these programs.

It shall further be the policy of the American Legion to sponsor extension of existing Government credit facilities to enable disabled veterans to obtain farm purchase and operating loans.

It shall further be the policy of the American Legion to endorse and encourage adequate programs to make available: (1) rural medical care, (2) extension of power lines to rural areas, (3) improved farm-to-market roads, (4) improved marketing facilities, (5) extension and improvement of rural education.

It shall further be the policy of the American Legion to endorse and encourage adequate programs to conserve and extend our natural resources.

On March 7, 1947, at the national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion, in the city of Washington, the following recommendation was adopted with regard to the activities of the United States Department of Agriculture:

That the United States Department of Agriculture should make available maximum assistance, not only in providing financing but also in planning and sound management guidance.

You take your positions with the facts before you. The Republican Party must take full responsibility for the result achieved. This is a sad day for American agriculture. This is the testing ground. This is the place where the roll is called; the place where the truth, however cruel and disappointing it may be, is made known.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the difficulty of trying to examine 2,800 pages of hearings. I appreciate also the advantage that the members of the subcommittee enjoy because for seven solid weeks they have lived with this thing intimately. So now and then inaccuracies creep into the debate, which are quite natural. That is understandable.

Let us look at this whole picture a moment. Is it such a heinous crime for the chairman of a subcommittee to confer with his own leadership? Have you gentlemen not done it for 14 years? Is it treason or a felony for the chairman of this subcommittee to sit down with the distinguished Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], or the distinguished majority leader of this House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], or the steering committee, and compare notes on matters of policy? Is there something so wrong with that? But that is not the reason there was a reconsideration of some items in this bill.

That reconsideration took place on the afternoon of May 20, early in the week, and let me tell you why it took place. It was on a previous Saturday that the very esteemed President of the United States had notified the Secretary of Agriculture to convene a conference on the 9th of June, a few days from now, and that the conference should concern itself with one thing—the appreciation in land values.

What did the President say about it? First, he pointed out that land values had appreciated 92 percent over the 1935–39 level. That is not the gentleman from Illinois speaking; that is the distinguished President of the United States from the great State of Missouri, your President and mine. He pointed out in that statement, which was made public, that in the last 12 months ending March 1, 1947, land values had increased by 12 percent. But the President said something more than that which intrigued my fancy, and I quote him:

In many areas land prices have reached peaks which cannot be sustained by probable long-time farm earnings.

In addition thereto he expressed a special concern for the war veterans of the country who are interested in buying land. My good friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], and my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], talked about the war veterans. I am interested in the war veterans and the President is interested in them also and does not want to see them saddled with high-priced farms which in the face of a recession of commodity levels will stick them and send the farms back to the Government or make them lose the farms as a result of foreclosure.

We reconsidered this matter and we finally took out farm-tenant loans entirely. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] wants to restore that $25,000,000.

Let us see in dollars and cents what has actually happened. I yield to no one in my regard for Mr. Lasseter, the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. He is a grand fellow, he is one of the finest administrators in Government today, he was candid and forthright with the committee. What did he say? He said first of all, and this is in contravention of the statements that have been made on the floor, that farms did not increase $3 over last year; they increased $1,700 over last year. Here are the figures: The 1945 average was $5,947; the 1946 average was $7,610. Those are Mr. Lasseter's figures.

But he said something more and you will find it on page 1416 of the hearings, if you are interested:

Owners are getting fearful right now, owners of land, and they want to sell to veterans, to farm tenants who can qualify.

The owners now want to get out and get the high price and stick the veteran and stick the farm tenant, then let the Government bail them out at a later date.

Mr. Lasseter said something else, and you will find it on page 1419 of the hearings. He said:

We have to shop around very carefully to get suitable farms.

They are very difficult to get. Now, there is an opportunity for the veteran,

and you gentlemen who have made a case here against this bill yesterday and today have not told the whole truth. Why do you not say that these are 40-year, 3½-percent loans and that there is an opportunity under the GI act to get 40-year, 3½-percent loans, and nearly three times as many have been made in the space of 18 months as would be made in twice that length of time under the Farmers Home Administration. So, the opportunity is there, and this is a wise and discreet action on the part of the committee, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 94, noes 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to solemnly protest the tragic action of the Appropriations Committee in fairly ruining our farm appropriations. This action is a calamity of the first magnitude to our rural sections. Its full proportions will not be seen for some time to come, but every section of the Nation will feel the impact of this drastic reduction within the next few months.

I feel the action of this committee in cutting the soil-conservation payments is especially to be condemned. Out of the full sum of $300,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget as being the sum necessary for this year, only $165,000,000 has been placed in this bill. This means a cut to the AAA program for the coming year of $135,000,000 on this item alone; and for the year following, it means the elimination of the entire program.

I doubt that there has been a single phase of the internal program which has meant so much to the farmer as the soil-conservation program and the soil-conservation payments. This program has transformed barren wastes into fertile producing areas. It has taken submarginal land and has made it produce in prolific quantities. It has made it possible in this time of world-wide food scarcity for our farmers to produce all-time records in crops. Our President has called upon our farmers to help produce for a starving world; and with the aid of this most valuable program they have gone to work and have done the job. Millions of people throughout the world who otherwise might starve will now live because of the remarkable results from this great program.

At this particular time, Mr. Chairman, the farmers in our section are interested in the fertilizer program. They have already made commitments for fertilizers, and they are now engaged in placing these fertilizers in the soil and over the meadows. They are moving ahead as requested by the President and as indicated by the statements of former President Hoover to again produce a record-breaking harvest. The world fairly cries out in anguish for the American farm production, and our farmers are working as the hungry peoples of the American and other lands pray for the harvest. At this particular time the cut of funds creates a new problem for them; it takes their mind off their work; it makes it impossible for them to meet some of their commitments; and it most assuredly will affect the amount of the harvest.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, $18,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 58, line 21, strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this matter deserves the serious consideration of each Member on the floor. There have been many times in the past when this agency was the Farm Security Administration that I certainly disagreed with many, many things in connection with it, but the gentlemen who have had charge of it in recent years have done a splendid job, with which I think all will agree. The thing you cannot avoid is that there are now $800,000,000 of debts outstanding that are owed to the United States, and those loans must be serviced. Those people should repay the Government of the United States and should pay their debts as fast as they can during the time their income is fairly good. The man who is now administering this agency has done a splendid job. Last year he was one of the few in the departments who came in with a request for less personnel. This year he came in with a request for still less personnel than last year. Last year an amendment was offered on this floor to reduce the administrative personnel of the then Farm Security Administration from $24,000,000 to $23,000,000, only a $1,000,000 cut. At that time the distinguished chairman of this committee opposed any such amendment and said:

There are many outstanding loans that must be collected, and you will find a table in the hearings to the effect that there are $16,000,000 that could be charged off at the present time. So if we reduce it too much and use what I commonly call a meat-ax technique with respect to this administrative appropriation, we may lose an equivalent amount or more and curtail or cripple some of these functions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the committee action stands and the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, it will reduce this administrative cost to 2.4 percent of the amount of outstanding assets to be administered.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

The fact that you have eliminated new loans will not cut out more than just a few people in the administrative personnel, but this agency under Mr. Lasseter reduced the personnel from 8,900 to 8,400 last year, and this year under the President's budget reduced it from 8,400 to 7,200. The committee cut this fund from $30,000,000 for the over-all operation to $25,000,000 in its first meeting, and 10 days later went back and cut out an additional $7,000,000. In 1 year you are reducing an agency that administers $800,000,000 of loans from 8,400 to 4,250 administrative personnel, if you do not adopt this amendment.

If the gentleman from Illinois was correct last year in saying that he was opposed to the use of a meat-ax technique, certainly when you reduce an agency to which you must look for the collection of $800,000,000 and cut it in half within 1 year, you are using the meat-ax technique.

I plead with you, whether you are in sympathy with this program or not, whether you are on this side of the aisle or on that side of the aisle, where you have an administrator that comes in and shows you a good record of reducing personnel in his agency by 1,000 or 1,500 people each successive year, I say that when he is charged with the obligation of collecting $800,000,000 and of trying to see that these people do come back and get to be good citizens and farm owners and worthy members of the agricultural fraternity, it is poor business to reduce this appropriation by any such figure as from $30,000,000 to $18,000,000, to reduce his personnel by approximately 50 percent. I think this amendment certainly should be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe it will be impossible to manage the affairs of this agency properly with the small amount of money that is now being provided?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it can be conservatively stated that we will lose $50,000,000 as a result of failure to provide properly for the administration of this agency.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, for more than 30 years the farmers and small-town business people have been interested in the development of an agricultural program which would bring some security and advancement to the farming sections of the country. Their claims to national attention and Federal interest have not been readily granted. The idea, centuries old, that the farmer should supply all others with food, fibers, and general assistance regardless of his own welfare or share in national pro-

gress, has persisted in opposition to every move to bring agriculture to a parity with industry. In consequence, the program has been slow in developing and insufficient for its purpose. The aim may be praised, but its accomplishment denied by those who fail to realize that only as agriculture propers can town and country alike share in general advancement and enhancement of opportunity.

After a war in which victory was made possible by the united endeavors of all, and in which those in agriculture fully met every responsibility, earning and gaining universal approval for their loyalty and the success of their endeavors, it would seem that there should be the warmest approval of expansion of an agricultural program rather than a determined effort to sabotage and destroy it. The program is not perfect. It needs improvement. Undoubtedly it has many weaknesses which are recognized, and which should be remedied. The common endeavor should be its proper expansion and the broadening of agricultural opportunity.

Instead of expansion, this appropriation bill, if enacted, will bring curtailment, and even the elimination of some activities. It s based upon the contention that farmers are doing better, some are making money, hence an insufficient program should be supplanted by another even more insufficient.

The national debt of $259,000,000,000 is pointed to as making necessary reductions in Federal appropriations for the Agricultural Department which administers the many laws passed by Congress for rural betterment. Regardless of the war endeavors of the farmers at home and on the battlefields, and the wartime restrictions which compelled them to live and work under severe handicaps while carrying on for our Nation's success and supremacy, now they are called upon to sacrifice more and more while our Government turns its attention and its resources, including those of agriculture, to the rehabilitation of the world.

This bill, if passed, will reduce Federal expenditures for the agricultural program by $393,000,000, or about 35 percent below the appropriations for the present fiscal year. Nobody objects to the minor economies which can be effected by stopping unnecessary departmental expenditures, the discharge of unnecessary employees, or other savings, even though small, in the interest of general economy, but the purpose should be to improve rather than to destroy. Some features of this bill serve rather to destroy than to improve.

Economy is a broad word. Economizing on agriculture by limiting funds for rural electrification, soil erosion, the Farmers Home Administration, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, school lunches, and other important activities accomplish relatively little savings when compared with other activities which add many times as much to the Federal budget.

For instance, in today's press is the statement that our Federal Treasury will expend nearly $5,000,000,000 for foreign relief of various kinds, an amount 12 times as great as the cut in appropriations in this measure. Recently Congress appropriated $300,000,000 for the rearmament of the army of Greece and rehabilitation of that country. At the same time, another $100,000,000 was voted for equipment for the armies of Turkey, for the possible protection of the American and British oil interests in the Middle East. In these appropriations alone our Treasury will be drawn upon for a greater amount than all the savings proposed in this bill for agriculture.

Is Congress so forgetful of the heroic work of our farmers in war and in peace that it will compel our farm program to be without funds in order to increase the power of the armies of Turkey and Greece? Must agriculture be called upon to pay the cost to the Treasury of the loans, grants, and gifts to Greece and Turkey?

Must the expansion of rural electrification, for instance, be stopped in order to send another $78,000,000 to Korea to rebuild the ruined industries owned by foreign interests in that country?

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Rural electrification has come a long way in my district in Wisconsin since the REA program began. We have 10 rural electric cooperatives that are now serving more than 22,000 members. The way these farm families are putting electric power to use for their own profit and convenience is a dramatic demonstration of the tremendous good that can come out of the rural electrification program.

The money that REA lent to these 10 cooperatives is paying dividends to the farmers, to the communities in which they live and in turn to the Nation. But the record does not stop there. The cooperatives are paying back the money they borrowed. They are paying it back with interest.

The 10 cooperatives in my district have paid $1,791,543 in principal and interest, and of this $93,921 has been ahead of schedule.

This outstanding record, which I know is duplicated in all parts of the country, raises a very serious question as to the wisdom of the House Appropriations Committee in reducing the REA appropriation for the next year. In the name of economy the committee proposes to sentence thousands of farmers to at least another year in darkness. This is not economy, because the money these farmers need to build power lines will eventually be paid back. Neither is it good sense to throw obstacles in the path of progress.

In my district, the House bill will affect about 9,000 farm families. All of them will have to wait longer for their light and power if the Rural Electrification Administration has to operate on a curtailed basis. About 5,000 of them will have to wait for loan fund allocations.

All through the war I received letters from farmers who told me how they were hoping to get electricity with the coming of peace. Since VJ-day many of them have told me they have their farms wired in anticipation of electric service. Occasionally a housewife tells me she has been lucky enough to buy a refrigerator or a milk cooler, and she is anxious to know how long it will be before she can put them into service.

These people are growing impatient. And I do not blame them. They have had an opportunity to see what electricity means to farmers who already have it. While other farmers are in a position to modernize, to cut production costs with cheap power, and to enjoy many of the comforts of twentieth century living, they—the farmers still without electricity—have got to wait. They have to continue living decades behind the times and they have to compete with farmers who are farming on an up-to-date scale.

There are more than 9,000 of these people in my district. Throughout the Nation there are two and one-half million. Some of them, I am sure, are in most congressional districts.

What are you going to tell those who helped elect you? That this action is taken to help cut their taxes? They know better—they know that the REA program is self-liquidating. Are you going to tell them that you do not care if they have to live by kerosene lantern an extra year or two?

If the House bill is approved as it now stands, it simply means this Congress has gone on record as holding back the extension of rural electric service. Is that the kind of a record this Congress wants to make? I, for one, will have no part of it.

Rural electrification is on the threshold of what could be its greatest year in history. Manpower and materials are becoming available again on a scale that would permit line construction to leap forward. The opportunity is here and we cannot take advantage of it by practicing false economy of the kind we have under consideration.

The administration of this program, as shown by its record, is one of efficiency and accomplishment. It has established a record unequaled by any private lending institution. In 1935 the Congress entrusted this agency with the job of making loans to electrify rural America. It has discharged its obligation well. More than $1,000,000,000 of Federal money has been lent to over 1,000 borrowers in a program that has directly and indirectly resulted in the electrification of nearly 60 percent of this country's farms—and, I repeat, this money is being paid back.

In my own district, I know of no Federal program that has done so much for my rural constituents, at such trifling cost to the Nation's taxpayers, as this rural electrification program. I am sure that most of my colleagues would be able to say the same.

I believe, and I know that the people whom I represent believe, that only two things could possibly delay the progress of rural electrification. One would be the influence of selfish interests; the other, our own nearsightedness. Obviously, we are not going to let selfish interests influence us in a matter in which the good of the entire country is involved. At the same time, let us not be nearsighted. If we fail to give full support to this valuable Nation-building

program, we will be guilty of subscribing to bad business.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Seventy-ninth Congress provided the Farmers Home Administration Act which took over most of the functions of the Farm Security Administration. The committee has deleted completely the budget estimate of $35,000,000 and provides no funds for farm tenant loans. The production and subsistence loan program has been reduced from $90,000,000 to $30,000,000. The Farm Tenant Mortgage Insurance fund has been reduced from an estimated $15,000,000 for 1948 to $1,000,000, and the item for salaries and expense to administer the program throughout the country has been reduced from $30,000,000 to $18,000,000.

The congressional district which I represent is made up of 11 rural counties in which farmers are largely engaged in the dairy industry. As a result of severe drought and low prices that prevailed in the middle thirties, many hard-working, conscientious farmers, through no fault of their own, lost their farms. When the old Farm Security Administration was established many of those farmers were given the opportunity to make a new beginning and to reestablish themselves as farm owners. Since the start of the program and up to January 1, 1947, 10,718 farmers in my district were granted loans to the extent of $8,670,723. Of that number of farmers, 409 were granted farm ownership loans to the extent of slightly less than $2,000,000, of which 109 have repaid their loans in full. Of the total of 10,718 farmers who received loans, 5,733 of such loans have been paid in full as of January 1, 1947, and the total amount loaned has been reduced from $8,670,723 to $2,176,184. As of January 1, 1947, 280 veterans of World War II applied for and received loans in the amount of $578,850. It is estimated that an additional 138 veterans will have had their loan applications approved as of June 30 of this year, making a total of 418 veterans' loans. Private banks in my district have cooperated fully with the Farmers Home Administration. In excess of 5,000 farmers in my district who have repaid their obligations to FSA and the Farmers Home Administration, are now having their credit needs taken care of by local banks and other lending institutions.

Today I received a letter from Mr. A. R. Vogtsberger, vice president of the Bank of Menomonie, Menomonie, Wis., which I quote:

Congressman MERLIN HULL,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HULL: I notice that the finance committee has cut the appropriation for the Farm Home Administration by 30 percent.

This seems to me to be a drastic cut since we feel that the administration of the loans that are now outstanding should be continued and we believe too that the cut of $15,000,000 to $1,000,000 for insured mortgages is entirely too drastic.

We believe the farmer has gotten to be the forgotten man again, and we do think that the program that the former Farm Security Administration carried on was a good one and should be continued; and as you will remember, we have cited many cases of farmers who could not have continued if it had not been for the Farm Security Administration.

We know you are opposed to such a cut, but we want you to know how we feel about it.

At the meeting of the Chippewa Club, which consists of 10 banks in this territory, each and every one of them was polled and they were all favorable to keeping the $15,000,000 for the guarantee of loans and also were favorable to the continuation of the FSA work.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. VOGTSBERGER.

The Farm Security Administration, and its successor, the Farmers Home Administration, have been important factors in encouraging family sized farm ownership, particularly in the interest of our returned servicemen who have no other means of securing the initial funds to acquire farm land, or, in the case of renters, to acquire operating equipment. The program has been highly successful in my State and in my district, and I doubt the wisdom of emasculating this excellent program as proposed in the bill.

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

As stated in the committee report, during the year 1946 about $234,000,000 was expended on the program in 55,000 schools throughout the country. Of this amount, $75,000,000 was provided by the Federal Government. The committee has reduced the Federal Government's appropriation from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. For the fiscal year 1947 the sum of $81,000,000 was made available for the program, of which $75,000,000 was obtained from section 32 funds under the act of 1935 which provided that 30 percent of the customs receipts could be used for various purposes, which included the school lunch program. The committee has recommended that all of section 32 funds for the year 1948 are to be rescinded.

During the 1947 fiscal year, $1,108,836.41 Federal food assistance was allocated to the State of Wisconsin from the Federal school lunch fund. With the aid of this Federal assistance, 131,718 Wisconsin school children participated in the grant-in-aid school-lunch program. If the present figure of $45,000,000, out of which $10,000,000 is earmarked for equipment, is appropriated, $525,573.72 will be available for Wisconsin's school lunch food assistance in 1948. This represents a decrease of about 53 percent. Unless a large additional amount is made available from within the State to offset this decrease, the Wisconsin school lunch program will be considerably curtailed the coming school year.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

No one can deny the patriotic response of farmers when requested by their Government to produce food and fiber to win a war. All time production records were broken with less help on the farms, and with worn-out and inadequate equipment. They are still being asked to maintain high levels of production to feed the starving world.

Farmers who were gradually recovering from the great drought and depression of the thirties, during which time soil fertility had become seriously depleted, were again called upon to produce for victory. During the past few years soil fertility has again become depleted. The AAA was, and is, an important factor in stepping up the usage of phosphate and potash fertilizers, and limestone. AAA personnel aided farmers in demonstrating the practicability of strip and contour farming, which added many thousands of tons of food to national production. It should be a matter of public interest to see that the land that produced the food for our armed forces, and much of the food for our allies, is brought back to average productive efficiency.

In Wisconsin in 1937 only 415,000 tons of agricultural limestone was used, as compared with the present level of production and use of limestone of 2,250,000 tons per year. Even prior to the war there was great concern with regard to the general problem of erosion and our dwindling forestry resources. Included in the AAA program was that of farm forestry and gully control, as well as tree planting.

AAA has supplied soil conservation materials, 50 percent of the cost of which was borne by the farmers who applied the materials, planted the trees, and so forth. In Wisconsin from 1940 through 1946 there has been applied 503,414 tons of phosphate and potash fertilizer, 10,422,300 tons of agricultural limestone, 47,301 acres have been planted to trees in connection with the farm-forestry and gully-control program, and 2,028,700 acres are part of the strip and contour-farming program. From 1940 to the present the records indicate sharp increases in accomplishments as described, which demonstrates increasing efficiency on the part of AAA personnel, and greater farmer participation and interest in the program.

In connection with the agricultural-limestone program, there was more involved than simply the application of the ingredient to the soil. Large numbers of people and much expensive equipment had to be provided to quarry limestone deposits, pulverize, and transport it. Such processors of limestone felt they were working on a continuing program. One of the lime-works operators in my district has stated to me that the proposed cut in the 1947 AAA program will bankrupt 70 percent of the limestone producers and truckers who acquired equipment relying on bona-fide contracts entered into with their Government for the 1947 program.

The administrative budget has been so reduced as to end for all practical purposes the popular and wholly justifiable Federal program to aid in the rebuilding of the soil on American farms.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe if any person were to study the lessening of duties that are today facing the Farmers Home Administrator he would find that this allowance of $18,000,000 is absolutely reasonable.

Keep in mind another thing. Times are good all throughout the agricultural regions. Farmers do not have any difficulty today in find the money necessary to pay what is due the Government. They do not need much supervision from

any agency of Government. They will pay their loans if they have a good crop and decent prices.

We have fought several times on the floor today against this growing bureaucracy. Here is where there is a great deal of it. Here is where we have excessive duplication in government. Do you people realize that the Farmers Home Administration in many ways duplicates the work of the Extension Service?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If there was a consolidation of these duplicating activities, we could save $20,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe that we could save at least that under the bill if the Committee on Agriculture would bring together under one head, Extension Service preferably the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, the Farmers Home Administration, and the AAA county and township committee organization.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the Congress is going to deprive the returning rural veteran of the opportunity to buy a country home or a farm——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further because the gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. The returning veteran does have the opportunity under the GI bill of rights to make a loan. We are not depriving him of that. That is a different category of loan. In this particular portion of the bill we are keeping that veteran from having a great big mortgage indebtedness piled on top of his head from under which he can never get out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 93, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, therefore made to the Secretary under the provisions of the acts named above, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or advances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen men jump from one side of a fence to the other, but I have never seen a man on both sides of a fence at the same time.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who just addressed the House a moment ago, stood here and argued very forcefully and, apparently from the vote, very persuasively, that he was trying to protect the poor veterans from the evils of inflation. Then, in the next breath, he said we did not need this agency. He said, "We have all the money we need under the GI bill of rights in another agency of the Government."

How can you sincerely maintain the position that your objection to this bill is that you are trying to protect the veterans from inflation and stand here and argue that we have another agency of the Government, which you favor, which has plenty of money to make loans to veterans on the present farm real estate market? The fact is, and everybody knows and I think the country will know, that it is not due to the fear of inflation, it is not due to a letter from Mr. Truman or a letter to Mr. Anderson, but it is due solely to a desire on the part of the Republican Party to reduce the expenditure of Government funds. That is all it is. If you can justify your position, then applaud the statement. So the RECORD does show that that remark brought forth almost unanimous and universal applause from the Republican side. I notice that not a single Democrat applauded.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Have the Republicans reached any conclusion yet as to how much they will reduce the budget?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think they have, but I think they know this is just fallacy. The Republicans are saying that they are saving money everywhere along the line, and they are trying to cut down Government expenditures. What they are doing is depriving 49,000 veterans of the right to buy a farm home and an opportunity to finance it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. It seems pretty clear, does it not, that the Republicans have decided that the easiest place to make reductions is to take it out of the farmer's hide?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. It is an effort to wreck the farm program. That is all it is, pure and simple. You took all the section 32 money; you completely destroyed the crop-insurance program, and now you destroy the tenant purchase program.

There is no way for you to get around the fact that you are accomplishing just this. If you are going to handicap this agency financially and not give Mr. Lasseter, the Administrator, the necessary money with which to operate, it would be better to repeal the whole agency and deprive it of the operating loan also, because, frankly, a veteran can now obtain money to operate his farm and to finance his farm operations much more easily than he can obtain a 40-year loan at 3-percent interest to finance the purchase of a farm home.

Take the crop-insurance program. When we liquidated that Corporation before we gave it $3,000,000 with which to liquidate, but now you give them only $1,000,000. When the show is over and the collections are all in you will lose far more than $1,000,000, the amount you are giving the Corporation. I dare say collections will not be as good 12 months from now, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as they are now. When you cut this personnel more than 50 percent you cannot expect the same degree of efficiency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we do not cut down somewhere how are we going to get money enough to give the Turks and the Greeks that the gentleman wants to give them and a lot of others want to give them?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what the gentleman wants to give them but I know I voted for the Greek loan and I do not apologize to the gentleman from Michigan or anyone else for the way I voted. I voted for the $350,000,000 loan for general foreign relief, and I do not have to apologize to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman want to give less to our farmers so we can give more to the Greeks and the Turks?

Mr. COOLEY. I have been working all along in the interest of our farmers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to have them get something somewhere along the line.

Mr. COOLEY. What the gentleman's party is doing is wrecking the program, and the responsibility is being fixed in the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 3601, appropriates

roundly $805,000,000 for the Agricultural Department for the fiscal year 1948. This is approximately four times more than was appropriated in 1930 and nearly six times more than the average annual cost from 1921 to 1930. The Department of Agriculture has grown into a giant bureaucracy that is eating out the substance of our people, distorting natural price relationships, and regimenting the farmers.

Like most of the executive agencies of the Government, it has become a powerful engine for confiscating private property and redistributing what it does not use for its own sustenance, not only with respect to the farming communities and other industrial interests, but in respect of the farmers themselves.

It is the grossest delusion that the political authority in Washington can put a floor under agricultural prices without regimenting the farmer and dictating the amount of wheat, corn, or other crop affected by such floor he may grow. So-called parity prices can ultimately be sustained only by the exercise of the power of the political regime controlling the Government to dictate to the farmer not only how much but also what he shall grow.

This is fully recognized by the crop allotment program instituted under the AAA. Tyranny is the weapon used to enforce compliance. Farmers are fined for growing more wheat than they are ordered to grow. The ultimate effectiveness of the program is dependent upon the enforcement of the crop allotment plan. It was specifically instituted for that purpose.

The Agriculture Department has become a menace to our people through the use to which it is being put in the international field. I refer to the system of pooling the crops the American farmer grows with those produced by other nations and leaving it to an international agency, where the United States has only one vote, to determine what portion of such pool shall be allocated to the United States.

The danger to the American people of this policy becomes evident when it is realized that the sugar shortage is primarily caused by this program.

Few people realize that this program is to be extended to include many other farm crops.

I submit that this is a dangerous program to the American people. The Agricultural Department has become a gigantic political exploiting machine and should be abolished.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because it is now becoming apparent that those of us who want to speak on some of the amendments which will be offered will be denied that opportunity. The request will be made to limit debate by unanimous consent. When that is refused, a motion to that effect will be offered, which will be carried, in spite of all the assurances of yesterday that there would be adequate opportunity for everyone to express their views.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to one of the widespread misunderstandings in regard to the money now available to the REA. That amendment will come up shortly. The REA, of course, is one of those agencies that has a great public appeal, it is serving a great number of farm people; a great many more people would like to have its services. I recognize it has not been possible for the REA to extend its lines to everyone who would like to have the service of that organization. It has not been possible to build all of the lines for which money has been appropriated in the past year or two; neither has it been possible for everybody in the United States who had the money to pay for an automobile to buy one. It has not been possible to get a great many of the things our people would like to buy and for which they may have the funds.

Presently there is something over $300,000,000 that has been appropriated and is still in the hands of the REA. We have been told on the floor of this House that that money is available for allocation to build new lines, but that is incorrect. That money is not available for allocation. That money, every dollar of it, has been allocated. If you want a new line authorized or approved in your district or anywhere else in the United States, you have to provide additional funds here for lending purposes. It cannot be done out of the money that has been promised to build a line off across the creek. You simply cannot take that same money and build a line on the other side of the creek. The commitments are out on that money. There is no money in the REA from which you can make new allocations.

The REA now has applications pending for about $240,000,000. By July 1 the REA expects to have applications in excess of $270,000,000. If we appropriate all of the money that is provided here, we will be short probably forty-five or fifty million dollars on the 1st of July of being able to take care of all the applications already pending.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The REA will have applications for $270,000,000 on the 1st of July. If this bill passes in its present form, there will only be available $225,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and I want to make it perfectly clear that this sum is a reduction both from the amount available this year and from the Budget estimates. There are those who have erroneously stated that it is not a reduction, but let the Members of the House know what the situation is. On page 376 the Budget reads:

> Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5 of said act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, $25,000,000; and for the same purposes an additional sum of $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act.

Heretofore the law has required that REA get a portion of its funds from the RFC. The RFC could only lend 85 percent of the principal of the outstanding obligations constituting security for its loans. The exact wording of the law is found in 49 Statutes, page 1364, and reads:

> *Provided*, That no such loan shall be in an amount exceeding 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting security therefor.

This means there had to be certain appropriations from the Congress in order to make the first loans, or at least to provide the necessary 15 percent margin. The Budget recommended this year that there be an appropriation of $25,000,000 from the general fund for loans and that there be additional authority for REA to borrow $225,000,000 from RFC. Both the $25,000,000 of direct appropriations and the $225,000,000 of RFC funds, which made $250,000,000, were available for loans to build lines and to make allocations in the coming year. This bill provides but $225,000,000. Figure it with any kind of pencil you want to, there is $25,000,000 that you are not going to get to build lines in your district, and mine, to serve people who are now applying that we would have had if we passed the Budget estimate.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this $25,000,000 which was deleted was available for loaning purposes?

Mr. POAGE. Of course it was. If the gentleman will but read the Budget, he will see that it was listed as for loans.

Mr. HORAN. It was on deposit.

Mr. POAGE. Oh, no; it was not on deposit. The gentleman simply does not understand how we made loans under the old set-up. I do not like to be dogmatic, but I happened to have been on the subcommittee that wrote that bill under which we have been operating, and I believe I know how it worked. We could make loans from the RFC up to 85 percent of the principal of the obligations constituting the security for the RFC loans. In other words, suppose there was only one loan involved. If the REA were to loan $100,000 to a local co-op, it would be necessary that the REA finance $15,000 out of appropriated funds. Then it could get $85,000 of RFC funds. In other words, RFC never advanced more than 85 percent of the funds. At least 15 percent of all funds REA ever loaned had to come from appropriated funds, and that is the reason it was necessary to make part of the loan funds available in the form of a direct appropriation. The $25,000,000 which the budget proposed to supply as a direct appropriation would provide funds with which REA could make loans to local cooperatives totaling $25,000,000, and in addition the notes taken to secure this amount would, in turn, serve as the needed "margin" to support an RFC loan to the REA of several times that amount.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, 65,000 Iowa families still do not have electric service. They are among those called

upon to produce the food which is now going to all corners of the world. They should not be penalized in the splendid work they are called upon to do, and the expansion of the REA program today in many respects is more vital than it was in the war years.

The loan funds last year totalled $350,000,000 including a one-hundred-million-dollar deficiency appropriation. The present appropriation bill seeks to cut the loan authorization to $225,000,000, which amounts to a cut of 37.5 percent. Such a reduction will seriously cripple the REA program in Iowa.

A large backlog of applications already exists, and if the needed appropriations are not forthcoming there will be a long delay in getting electricity to those Iowa farmers who do not already have the service. It is estimated that if the proposed cuts for REA go through 25 percent fewer Iowa farm people can secure electricity in 1948 than if the cuts were restored. I speak out for the farm people of my State who certainly are going to be penalized if the proposed cuts are made.

The loans made under the REA program are a sound investment. This money is not a gift, and anyone who knows the facts will agree that the repayment record of the REA cooperatives continues to be very satisfactory. In view of the splendid record made in the loan field, and in view of the great need for the expansion of the program at this very time, let me urge the Congress to appropriate the money needed to effectively carry on the splendid work that is being done by REA for the rural people of America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $4,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this section be considered as read, because both items should come in the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the section is as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5 of said act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act.

Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections 4 and 5 of this act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order No. 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947, shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the foregoing provision: *Provided*, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed 35 years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than 5 years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions of this act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a), any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

"SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the payment of such loans all moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 61, line 3, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,600,000," and on page 61, line 6, strike out "$225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for the purpose of offering a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. Rankin: On page 61, line 3, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,600,000," and in line 6 strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, REA was not established until 1935. It has been in existence only 12 years, and six of those years were war years, with all their limitations on labor, material, and appropriations. And yet in those 12 years electricity has been brought to 10,000,000 farmers; REA lines span the continent and serve the people of every State in the Union.

Few services have been provided for agriculture in the last 2,000 years—from the days of Cincinnatus down to the present time—which have contributed so generously to the health and comfort and happiness and prosperity of the American farm, and especially the American home. I mention the home especially, because it is to the women and children of the family it renders its greatest service and upon whom it bestows its choicest blessings.

It offers the solution of one of the national problems of the day. There has been an alarming drift of population from the country to the cities. All that is best in national character is reared on the farm and exemplified in the farm family. Economists and statesmen have studied the problem for a generation. And here is the answer. Through the medium of REA we are bringing heat, light, and power to the farmstead—and at a rate the farmer can pay. At last we are offering inducements which will keep the young generation down on the farm.

But the success of this great program is menaced by the curtailment of funds with which to finance its expansion. Instead of recommending appropriations sufficient to meet its barest needs, the committee is proposing to deny money needed both for loans to farmers and for administrative expenses essential to its maintenance and development.

Mr. Chairman, the most dangerous and damaging limitation that can be made in the REA program is the proposed cut in administrative expenses. Administration is the nerve center, the motive power, and at the same time the governor. It does not matter how much money you

have for lending, if you do not have the administration and supervision to process applications and direct operations you might as well have nothing at all. Administration is the vital point in the success of the program. And the heavy cut in administrative expense recommended by the committee—from $5,600,000 to $4,000,000—means the denial or at best the delay, of services to thousands of waiting farm families, with handicaps in both the quantity and the quality of supervision.

I know, Mr. Chairman, the argument that will be made here that they already have more money than they can use, that they cannot get labor and material and cannot spend what they have. But, Mr. Chairman, as our American philosopher, Josh Billings well said: "It is better not to know so much than to know so much that aint so." When the Administrator was before the committee I asked him how much money they needed, how much money they could use. I asked him if the $250,000,000 recommended by the budget was sufficient. He said, no, that they had asked for $300,000,000, and that the full $250,000,000 was not sufficient to meet their needs and supply installations. The gentleman from Texas has already explained, and I will not go into it, that the money on hand has been allocated and will not be available to accommodate new business.

This is a long-term program. Applications are coming in every month. I do not know what you get from your districts, but from my State we are continuously in receipt of letters appealing for service, "Why cannot we have the REA? Why cannot I be connected? Why cannot you run a line down to my farm?" There is a universal demand throughout the country for this service. The gratifying part of it is that it does not cost the Federal Government a cent. All of this money is coming back. It is not given, but lent—and on good security.

My friends, why should we deny the farmer's wife and children this great boon of modern civilization? Why should we refuse them when it costs the Government nothing and will be paid back with interest?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments to the REA title in the bill close in 15 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will not insist on that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am asking for the adoption of this amendment to give to the REA not the $361,000,000 the co-ops say they need. Frankly, that is what I should like to see done. But to give the $300,000,000 that the head of the REA asked for.

Let us see what the situation is. You have $340,000,000 already allocated. They talk about this fund or this amount being provided. It is already allocated, and your farmers who have not asked for and been allotted funds will not be taken care of unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Am I to understand that the present Bureau of the Budget reduced the request of the REA by $50,000,000?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Before it came to the Congress?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. And I do not propose to have the Bureau of the Budget legislate for me on rural electrification legislation. When the Steelman order was issued it paralyzed rural electrification. I took the proposition up with the President and got that order changed in order that we might proceed to electrify the farm homes of the Nation.

Frankly, the co-ops in my district have been fairly well cared for. I doubt if they will get a dollar of this money, because they have already secured their loans. But your people are going to need every dollar of this money. You have provided for $225,000,000. There will be $270,000,000 of applications by the 30th day of June to cover that $225,000,000. And $30,000,000 worth of applications are coming in every month. That means that by the first of the year you will have more than enough applications to absorb this entire $300,000,000.

Remember, this is not money that you are giving to anybody. Every dollar of this money comes back with interest. Not only that, but it is enriching the farm homes of America, and therefore enriching the Nation.

You are stimulating the pride of the farm women. You are relieving the drudgery on the farms and in the farm homes. This money will do more good than any other money provided in this bill. Nothing we have ever done for the American farmer has been worth as much to him as rural electrification.

For the first time in the history of this country the rural children are rushing through school to get back home, whereas 15 years ago they were rushing through school to get away from home.

This is building up our own country. It is building your State and mine. There is no politics in it. It does not matter whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, the light looks the same. Your people are clamoring for it. The fact is that some of your States have far surpassed my State in the use of the money that has already been provided. But if you cut this down to $225,000,000, we are already assured that there will be cooperatives turned away for want of funds, which will result in slowing down the greatest program ever established for the benefit of the American farmers.

If I did not feel so deeply on this proposition, if I had not gone through this fight for the last 15 years, if I had not been in contact with the farmers of every State in this Union, if I had not seen what rural electrification was doing, I would not be standing here now making this fight at the end of a hectic day when you are all tired and want to get out. But I say to you it is necessary that this amendment be adopted in order to provide funds, not to give to somebody, but to enable our farmers to help themselves. For your information, I am inserting a table showing the progress we have made in rural electrification since I began this fight.

The matter referred to follows:

*Rural Electrification Administration: Number and percent of farms receiving central-station electric service, by States, 1934, 1940, 1945, and 1946*

| State, division, and territory | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934 [1] | | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940 [3] | | Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1945 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1945 | Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1946 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946 | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946 | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1946 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to Dec. 31, 1946 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent [2] | Number | Percent [4] | Number | Percent [6] | Percent | Number | Percent [6] | Percent | Number | Number | Percent [6] | Percent |
| Maine | 13,959 | 33.3 | 20,221 | 51.9 | 27,087 | 64.2 | 94.0 | 29,072 | 68.9 | 108.3 | 15,113 | 30,165 | 71.5 | 116.1 |
| New Hampshire | 9,495 | 53.7 | 10,845 | 65.5 | 15,298 | 81.4 | 61.1 | 16,054 | 85.5 | 69.1 | 6,559 | 16,605 | 88.4 | 74.9 |
| Vermont | 7,945 | 29.4 | 12,213 | 51.8 | 18,916 | 71.4 | 138.1 | 21,857 | 82.5 | 175.1 | 13,912 | 23,708 | 89.5 | 198.4 |
| Massachusetts | 14,494 | 41.3 | 26,220 | 82.2 | 33,287 | 89.9 | 129.7 | 34,071 | 92.1 | 135.1 | 19,577 | 34,647 | 93.6 | 139.0 |
| Rhode Island | 1,975 | 45.6 | 2,457 | 81.5 | 3,148 | 87.4 | 59.4 | 3,248 | 90.1 | 64.5 | 1,273 | 3,308 | 91.8 | 67.5 |
| Connecticut | 10,138 | 31.5 | 16,995 | 80.3 | 20,155 | 90.6 | 98.8 | 21,133 | 95.0 | 108.5 | 10,995 | 21,251 | 95.5 | 109.6 |
| New England | 58,006 | 36.7 | 88,951 | 65.8 | 117,891 | 78.4 | 103.2 | 125,435 | 83.5 | 116.2 | 67,429 | 129,684 | 86.3 | 123.6 |

Footnotes at end of table.

*Rural Electrification Administration: Number and percent of farms receiving central-station electric service, by States, 1934, 1940, 1945, and 1946*—Continued

| State, division, and territory | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934 [1] | | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940 [3] | | Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1945 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1945 | Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1946 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946 | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946 | Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1946 [5] | | Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to Dec. 31, 1946 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent [2] | Number | Percent [4] | Number | Percent [6] | Percent | Number | Percent [6] | Percent | Number | Number | Percent [6] | Percent |
| New York | 57,825 | 32.7 | 102,283 | 66.7 | 125,433 | 83.9 | 116.9 | 134,237 | 89.8 | 132.1 | 76,412 | 137,986 | 92.3 | 138.6 |
| New Jersey | 15,162 | 51.6 | 21,298 | 82.4 | 23,697 | 90.4 | 56.3 | 24,656 | 94.0 | 62.6 | 9,494 | 24,851 | 94.7 | 63.9 |
| Pennsylvania | 45,182 | 23.6 | 94,081 | 55.7 | 125,612 | 73.1 | 178.0 | 136,388 | 79.4 | 201.9 | 91,206 | 141,544 | 82.4 | 213.3 |
| Middle Atlantic | 118,169 | 29.7 | 217,662 | 62.5 | 274,742 | 79.1 | 132.5 | 295,281 | 85.0 | 149.9 | 177,112 | 304,381 | 87.6 | 157.6 |
| Ohio | 48,048 | 18.8 | 137,680 | 58.9 | 165,387 | 75.0 | 244.2 | 182,424 | 82.7 | 279.7 | 134,376 | 191,190 | 86.7 | 297.9 |
| Indiana | 23,476 | 11.7 | 91,127 | 49.4 | 125,931 | 71.6 | 436.4 | 137,369 | 78.1 | 485.1 | 113,893 | 142,857 | 81.2 | 508.5 |
| Illinois | 28,379 | 12.3 | 80,027 | 37.5 | 121,771 | 59.6 | 329.1 | 134,890 | 66.0 | 375.3 | 106,511 | 141,929 | 69.5 | 400.1 |
| Michigan | 42,152 | 21.4 | 131,126 | 69.9 | 146,325 | 83.5 | 247.1 | 153,725 | 87.7 | 264.7 | 111,573 | 158,109 | 90.2 | 275.1 |
| Wisconsin | 39,206 | 19.6 | 87,556 | 46.9 | 123,006 | 69.2 | 213.7 | 137,751 | 77.5 | 251.4 | 98,545 | 144,365 | 81.2 | 268.2 |
| East North Central | 181,261 | 16.7 | 527,516 | 52.4 | 682,420 | 71.5 | 276.5 | 746,159 | 78.2 | 311.6 | 564,898 | 778,450 | 81.6 | 329.5 |
| Minnesota | 13,783 | 6.8 | 50,075 | 25.4 | 93,208 | 49.3 | 576.3 | 106,284 | 56.2 | 671.1 | 92,501 | 110,800 | 58.6 | 703.9 |
| Iowa | 32,047 | 14.4 | 73,308 | 34.4 | 133,113 | 63.7 | 315.4 | 155,506 | 74.4 | 385.2 | 123,459 | 163,278 | 78.1 | 409.5 |
| Missouri | 17,893 | 6.4 | 39,204 | 15.3 | 77,852 | 32.0 | 335.1 | 97,942 | 40.3 | 447.4 | 80,049 | 108,786 | 44.8 | 508.0 |
| North Dakota | 1,968 | 2.3 | 3,218 | 4.4 | 7,498 | 10.8 | 281.0 | 8,601 | 12.4 | 337.0 | 6,633 | 9,451 | 13.6 | 380.2 |
| South Dakota | 2,939 | 3.5 | 3,981 | 5.5 | 8,964 | 13.0 | 205.0 | 10,143 | 14.8 | 245.1 | 7,204 | 10,866 | 15.8 | 269.7 |
| Nebraska | 9,544 | 7.1 | 22,832 | 18.9 | 39,120 | 35.0 | 310.0 | 40,689 | 36.4 | 326.3 | 31,145 | 40,378 | 36.1 | 323.1 |
| Kansas | 13,224 | 7.6 | 27,960 | 17.9 | 46,056 | 32.6 | 248.3 | 51,273 | 36.3 | 287.7 | 38,049 | 54,231 | 38.4 | 310.0 |
| West North Central | 91,398 | 7.7 | 220,578 | 20.2 | 405,811 | 39.3 | 344.0 | 470,438 | 45.6 | 414.7 | 379,040 | 497,790 | 48.2 | 444.6 |
| Delaware | 1,791 | 17.3 | 3,545 | 39.4 | 5,650 | 60.8 | 215.5 | 6,357 | 68.4 | 254.9 | 4,566 | 6,452 | 69.4 | 260.2 |
| Maryland | 6,791 | 15.3 | 17,170 | 40.7 | 24,124 | 58.4 | 255.2 | 26,990 | 65.3 | 297.4 | 20,199 | 30,036 | 72.7 | 342.3 |
| Virginia | 14,954 | 7.6 | 42,144 | 24.1 | 65,035 | 37.6 | 334.9 | 77,786 | 44.9 | 420.2 | 62,832 | 84,854 | 49.0 | 467.4 |
| West Virginia | 3,647 | 3.5 | 25,199 | 25.4 | 39,148 | 40.1 | 973.4 | 44,137 | 45.2 | 1,110.2 | 40,490 | 48,331 | 49.5 | 1,225.2 |
| North Carolina | 9,672 | 3.2 | 67,627 | 24.3 | 113,574 | 39.5 | 1,074.3 | 131,378 | 43.7 | 1,258.3 | 121,706 | 141,237 | 49.1 | 1,360.2 |
| South Carolina | 3,796 | 2.3 | 27,568 | 20.0 | 55,114 | 37.3 | 1,351.9 | 63,227 | 42.8 | 1,565.6 | 59,431 | 68,147 | 46.1 | 1,695.2 |
| Georgia | 6,956 | 2.8 | 42,409 | 19.6 | 82,248 | 36.4 | 1,082.4 | 95,727 | 42.4 | 1,276.2 | 88,771 | 103,531 | 45.8 | 1,388.3 |
| Florida | 5,700 | 7.8 | 15,476 | 24.9 | 24,750 | 40.5 | 334.2 | 30,792 | 50.3 | 440.2 | 25,092 | 32,389 | 53.0 | 468.2 |
| South Atlantic | 58,307 | 4.6 | 241,138 | 23.7 | 409,643 | 39.3 | 668.5 | 476,394 | 45.7 | 793.6 | 423,087 | 514,977 | 49.4 | 866.1 |
| Kentucky | 8,480 | 3.0 | 38,607 | 15.3 | 72,602 | 30.4 | 756.2 | 87,791 | 36.8 | 935.3 | 79,311 | 94,571 | 39.7 | 1,015.2 |
| Tennessee | 9,727 | 3.6 | 38,884 | 15.7 | 71,458 | 30.5 | 634.6 | 83,381 | 35.6 | 757.2 | 73,654 | 87,487 | 37.3 | 799.4 |
| Alabama | 11,053 | 4.0 | 33,907 | 14.6 | 73,129 | 32.7 | 561.6 | 86,564 | 38.8 | 683.2 | 75,511 | 94,133 | 42.1 | 751.7 |
| Mississippi | 2,802 | .9 | 26,078 | 9.0 | 52,816 | 20.0 | 1,784.9 | 64,435 | 24.5 | 2,199.6 | 61,633 | 75,047 | 28.5 | 2,578.3 |
| East South Central | 32,062 | 2.8 | 137,476 | 13.4 | 270,005 | 28.1 | 742.1 | 322,171 | 33.6 | 904.8 | 290,109 | 351,238 | 36.6 | 995.5 |
| Arkansas | 2,943 | 1.2 | 21,303 | 9.8 | 46,149 | 23.2 | 1,468.1 | 63,102 | 31.8 | 2,044.1 | 60,159 | 68,558 | 34.5 | 2,229.5 |
| Louisiana | 2,826 | 1.7 | 16,058 | 10.7 | 36,778 | 28.4 | 1,201.4 | 49,239 | 38.1 | 1,642.4 | 46,413 | 54,933 | 42.5 | 1,843.8 |
| Oklahoma | 5,648 | 2.6 | 20,149 | 11.2 | 49,473 | 30.0 | 775.9 | 64,548 | 39.2 | 1,042.8 | 58,900 | 70,134 | 42.6 | 1,141.7 |
| Texas | 11,466 | 2.3 | 79,127 | 18.9 | 162,290 | 42.2 | 1,315.4 | 196,910 | 51.1 | 1,617.3 | 185,444 | 212,508 | 55.2 | 1,753.4 |
| West South Central | 22,883 | 2.0 | 136,637 | 14.2 | 294,690 | 33.6 | 1,187.8 | 373,799 | 42.6 | 1,533.5 | 350,916 | 406,133 | 46.3 | 1,674.8 |
| Montana | 2,768 | 5.5 | 7,947 | 19.0 | 11,401 | 30.2 | 311.9 | 13,497 | 35.8 | 387.6 | 10,729 | 14,299 | 37.9 | 416.6 |
| Idaho | 13,433 | 29.8 | 25,439 | 58.3 | 32,139 | 77.4 | 139.3 | 34,733 | 83.7 | 158.6 | 21,300 | 35,644 | 85.9 | 165.3 |
| Wyoming | 527 | 3.0 | 3,474 | 23.1 | 5,632 | 43.1 | 968.7 | 6,283 | 48.0 | 1,092.2 | 5,756 | 6,485 | 49.6 | 1,130.6 |
| Colorado | 7,145 | 11.2 | 14,823 | 28.8 | 24,637 | 51.7 | 244.8 | 28,133 | 59.1 | 293.7 | 20,988 | 29,986 | 63.0 | 319.7 |
| New Mexico | 1,350 | 3.3 | 4,479 | 13.1 | 7,645 | 25.7 | 466.3 | 10,250 | 34.5 | 659.3 | 8,900 | 10,618 | 35.8 | 686.5 |
| Arizona | 5,577 | 29.6 | 5,607 | 30.4 | 9,280 | 70.6 | 66.4 | 9,594 | 73.0 | 72.0 | 4,017 | 10,703 | 81.4 | 91.9 |
| Utah | 16,130 | 52.5 | 17,411 | 68.5 | 20,019 | 76.1 | 24.1 | 20,762 | 78.9 | 28.7 | 4,632 | 20,872 | 79.3 | 29.4 |
| Nevada | 946 | 25.6 | 1,555 | 43.5 | 1,639 | 47.8 | 73.3 | 1,713 | 50.0 | 81.1 | 767 | 1,838 | 53.6 | 94.3 |
| Mountain | 47,876 | 17.6 | 80,735 | 34.6 | 112,392 | 52.9 | 134.8 | 124,965 | 58.8 | 161.0 | 77,089 | 130,445 | 61.4 | 172.5 |
| Washington | 40,060 | 47.5 | 58,283 | 71.4 | 68,194 | 85.4 | 70.2 | 72,388 | 90.6 | 80.7 | 32,328 | 74,670 | 93.5 | 86.4 |
| Oregon | 17,839 | 27.5 | 36,369 | 58.8 | 48,635 | 77.0 | 172.6 | 51,857 | 82.1 | 190.7 | 34,018 | 52,802 | 83.6 | 196.0 |
| California | 81,093 | 53.9 | 107,904 | 81.3 | 121,873 | 87.7 | 50.3 | 123,246 | 88.7 | 52.0 | 42,153 | 124,036 | 89.3 | 53.0 |
| Pacific | 138,992 | 46.4 | 202,556 | 73.3 | 238,702 | 84.7 | 71.7 | 247,491 | 87.8 | 78.1 | 108,499 | 251,508 | 89.2 | 81.0 |
| United States | 743,954 | 10.9 | 1,853,249 | 30.4 | 2,806,296 | 47.9 | 277.2 | 3,182,133 | 54.3 | 327.7 | 2,438,179 | 3,364,606 | 57.4 | 352.3 |

[1] Edison Electric Institute.
[2] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1935 United States census of agriculture
[3] 1940 United States census.
[4] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1940 United States census.
[5] REA estimates, revised 1947, based on final United States census of agriculture, 1945.
[6] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1945 United States census of agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse wholeheartedly the sentiments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I do not think there is a single agency in the history of America that has contributed so much to the welfare of the people of America as the REA. I think we should look at the record they have set. Right now, for instance, their payments are $20,000,000 in advance of what they owe on their loan. You show me another agency or show me any agency in any foreign country where the repayments exceed by $20,000,000 what they owe the Government. With that kind of a record I think the committee should have accepted their terms without equivocation and without pressure from any source. I do not think the Bureau of the Budget should have cut the original demand.

Figures do not lie but there are too many liars who can figure. Figures can be made to prove anything. It is like the case of the family which had four children and they were discussing whether or not they should have five. The wife said she did not want a fifth child because statistics showed that every fifth child born was a Chinaman, and she did not want any Chinaman.

Let me give you some statistics. The difference between what the REA requested and what the committee allowed is the difference between whether or not 135,000 farmers in the United States of America are going to be connected with electricity in the coming fiscal year. I

think that the $5,000,000 to connect 135,000 farmers is well worth while. Let us put on the lights in America before we keep the lights burning all over the world.

The budget estimates provide for $250,000,000 in loan funds and $5,600,000 in administrative funds. The House bill provide for $225,000,000 in loan funds and $4,000,000 in administrative funds. These reductions below the budget estimates will seriously retard the progress of rural electrification and delay, for at least another year, the extension of electricity to 135,000 rural consumers.

The slow-down in the program will come at a time when the 2,500,000 farmers still without electricity are more keenly desirous of electrifying their farms than ever before. By July 1 the backlog of applications on hand will amount to $270,000,000 and will be accumulating at the rate of $30,000,000 per month. Farmers are insistently demanding the extension of electric power lines with which to modernize their living and working conditions. Construction materials required for rural power lines are becoming increasingly available. A reduction in REA funds will curtail the rural electrification program in what otherwise would unquestionably be by far the year of its greatest expansion.

The reduction in funds for salaries and expenses—amounting to $1,600,000—will have the effect of hampering program operations in the three major fields of activity—making loans, supervising construction, and protecting the Government's investment.

At the present time REA is striving to make loans to bring electric service to farmers in all sections of the country, even going into new sections in which little if no rural electrification development had been attempted prior to 1935. The reduction in lending operations will mean that the bulk of the loans will have to go to areas where the feasibility of rural electrification can be easily established; other communities that desire electricity just as much, but where more intensive preliminary studies must be made, will have to wait.

Under the agency's present program, it is estimated that about 198,000 miles of rural high lines could be completed in 1948. The committee reductions will bring this downward to an estimated 150,000 miles.

The agency will have the responsibility of servicing and safeguarding a billion dollars' worth of Government funds which have been lent to more than 1,000 borrowers. The successful operation of the electric systems so financed constitutes the real security for the Government. In the past, REA's counsel and advice—of a type which is available only from this agency—have enabled borrowers to cope with the management and operating problems to the extent that successful operations and prompt repayment have been the result. The percentage of farms electrified has increased from 11 percent to 57 percent in the last 12 years. Today advance payments on REA's loans amount to approximately $20,000,000, while delinquencies are negligible. So far the record has been outstanding. To curtail the program at this time invites a serious threat to a similar record in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, in 1½ minutes which the chairman of the subcommittee has so generously allowed to each of us who have expressed an interest in REA, I think I have just about enough time to call the attention of the American people to the interest that the great Republican Party has shown in keeping the lights burning in rural America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. No. The committee has very generously allotted me a minute and a half to speak for the rural people who want lights and cannot get them. I am sorry I cannot spend that time on the gentleman from Iowa. The committee has most generously expended 15 minutes of its valuable time considering the question of providing light and power for all the farming people of America—a touching tribute to their interest in rural people. Think of it, my friends, the chairman of the subcommittee supported almost unanimously by the membership of the majority party has taken official action and has as this record will reflect, decided that lights and power for farm people are worthy of exactly 15 minutes' time. Why, my friends, I am surprised to see such tremendous interest shown in the farming people of America. Full 15 minutes, not cut short to 12 or 14 minutes but full 15 minutes to be devoted to the American farmer. I am delighted to see that the Republican Party was willing to even recognize that there are farmers who still use kerosene lamps. I am sorry to see that the majority party gives every indication of refusing to provide money with which to enable these farmers to borrow enough to get lights. Mr. Chairman, to show my appreciation of the overwhelming generosity of the subcommittee chairman in the matter of time, I yield back the remaining two seconds of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at each point in the RECORD where I spoke today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the money represented by this cut will remove skilled and experienced engineers, competent scientists in the electrical field, who have done absolutely wonderful things for America.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I cannot yield when I only have a minute and a half. Too frequently I yield to my own hurt.

To give you an illustration, the cost of a transformer to reach up to the high-power line and bring the electricity down so it can be connected with a dairy or farmhouse was $1,500 until REA came. Now through the skill of two men on the force that is going to be eliminated entirely by this cut, the cost of transformers has been reduced to $20 apiece. They have been able to do away with so many poles as to be estimated to have saved a million dollars by plowing one shallow furrow and laying the line underground. They have invented a marvelous means of giving formers utterly without telephone lines or service, telephone service by "hitch-hiking" on light or power lines. This works better than regular telephone lines. Such geniuses in REA are to be fired by reason of these cuts.

Technical consultation, standardization and research activities dealing with rural power systems is a continuous and necessary activity and is the very foundation for the design, construction, and operation of an electric system. Unlike services such as engineering, bookkeeping, legal advice, and so forth, it cannot be contracted for locally by the individual REA borrowers. These services can only be carried out on an over-all national scale by specially trained engineers thoroughly familiar with the power industry. For example, the Consumers Service Section, Technical Standards Division of REA has been charged with the responsibility of conducting basic engineering studies of rural power systems, for the purpose of reducing costs and improving the quality of electric service to the farm power users.

Because of the reduced REA budget as recommended by the House committee this important function will be abolished or curtailed to such an extent that this type of service will be lost to rural power systems. Here is how the reduced budget affects this section. Sixty percent of the engineering positions will be abolished, including that of the section head. This particular section has demonstrated its value by reducing the cost in the operation of rural power systems by sponsoring the development and improvement of such equipment as oil circuit reclosers. This development alone has resulted in an annual savings of operating expenses of well over a million dollars on those projects who are now using this type of equipment. Considerable improvement in these reclosers can be made only by engineers who are familiar with switchgear design and performance and of power system operation.

At the present time this section has been actively engaged in the work being carried on by the Radio Technical Planning Board, which was created at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. This Board is composed of the radio and power industry representatives. The purpose of this Board is to consult with and make recommendations to the FCC on technical matters based on the best engineering practices in the proper application of radio communication by the many services who have need for this type of service. It has only been recent that the power utility group has been recognized by the FCC as a public servant which needs radio services for the protection of health and property. REA projects are particularly interested in this activity. The use of radio in the operation of rural power systems offers a tool in which the operator himself will be able to dispatch the maintenance

crews expeditiously to the location where an emergency exists. This, in effect, is a protection to life and property. It is well to point out here that the greater part of the rural power lines extend into remote areas which do not now have adequate communication facilities. This is definitely a handicap in the operation of rural power systems because valuable time is lost in restoring service after it has been interrupted. An interruption to a farm power user results in a direct financial loss to him.

Further, this section has been responsible for a reduction in transformer core losses which has resulted in a saving of many thousands of dollars annually in the purchase of wholesale power. These are only a few items to indicate what has been accomplished by this Section.

The need for basic engineering on rural power circuits will always exist. Very little is known about load characteristics on rural circuits. Insufficient data is available for use in the future design of rural power lines because the nature and type of load are practically unknown. The REA-financed systems offer one of the best laboratories for obtaining this information.

Inductive coordination problems have been very successfully handled by the Consumers Service Section. The nature of this work deals with interference from power lines to communication circuits, such as telephone, telegraph, and radio. Through good engineering practices both power and communication circuits have been so coordinated that the average layman has never known that such a problem existed. Of necessity, both power and communication circuits must be designed and constructed to operate with the least amount of interference to each other so that the best quality of service may be rendered to the rural population. It has been demonstrated on many occasions by engineers of long experience that the coordination of power and communication circuits can be operated in the same area. It must be remembered that it requires highly skilled technicians to attain this objective.

Much has been said in recent years regarding telephone service in rural areas, which was probably brought about in the use of mechanical and electrical equipment on the farm. Senator LISTER HILL, Alabama, has introduced a bill in Congress for a Rural Telephone Administration. This created a challenge to the power and communication engineers, and, as published in a recent electrical engineering journal, the author pointed out that it is being attacked rigorously from three angles: First, there is great activity in the extension of direct-wire communications to the farm; second, intensive studies are being made and experiments carried on in the joint wire use of power poles for telegraph and telephone poles for power; third, intensive experiments are being carried on in the joint use of carrier telephones on power lines to render telephone service to farmers who have electric power service. This third item is generally known as telephone conversation hitchhiking over power lines. This is another instance where the Consumers Service Section has contributed toward improving living standards in the rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, we have heard on this floor many, many times that in Japan 90 percent of the rural farms are electrified. That is not by any means the condition with us. It is true that rural electrification has spread rapidly in this country, but I tell you, Mr. Chairman, without the aid of this REA less than half of the rural farms now electrified would never have been electrified—and that in the home of Thomas A. Edison.

We know very well that municipalities are by law given preference, and cooperatives are given preference in the purchase of power produced by Government plants. If you want to carry out the plain intent of the law you must provide more money for REA. You will hamper it by cutting down this part of the program, and that is equivalent to nullifying the law we have already passed giving preference to REA for power produced at Government dams.

Every move to minimize the amount of money available to REA, or as in this case, to reduce the amount of money available for administration, reduces by that much the number of REA projects and the number of farmers not now supplied with electricity from being supplied. With our modern equipment it is possible to produce much more electricity than we have ever formerly produced. Especially is that true at the great dams on our rivers. I contend that those who want to restrict the output of hydroelectric power and restrict its availability to farmers are in effect bringing about a scarcity which can benefit no one excepting possibly the utilities who would serve a small fraction of the nearest farmers by taking the cream of the prospects, leaving the great majority unserved.

As I indicated, we have written into the law and it is on the statute books that preference shall be given in the sale of cheap power from Government dams to municipalities and to REA cooperatives in the disposition of such power. I know who have fought enacting such provisions during the years that I have been in Congress, and I know that regardless of their professions of interest in aiding farmers, they can without outright repealing those liberal preference laws through minimizing or limiting appropriations for REA, make it possible to have the same effect as an outright repeal of such statutes would be. I have no desire to injure the private production of power and I am willing to protect the property rights of such as have pioneered utilities in new communities, but I will not go as far as to strengthen their monopolistic control by limiting the rural electrification program.

The gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Mississippi have made eloquent appeals. I wish we had more time to present this case.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the slash which has been made in funds for rural electrification. And it is utterly ridiculous for our friends on the right to point to the cutting of these funds as a saving for the American taxpayer, because every dollar of this appropriation will be repaid into the United States Treasury with interest, and the American people will not lose a dime. This kind of economy is as phony as a $3 bill.

Mr. Chairman, in 1934, only 10 percent of America's farms were electrified. And yet today, primarily through the splendid efforts and cooperative management of the REA, more than 52 percent of the rural homes enjoy the comforts and advantages of electricity. No program ever conceived or enacted by Congress has meant more to the American farmer, and I heartily and sincerely advocate not only its continuance, but also its expansion.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, and Committee members, that it is the rural citizen who produces so that the urban citizen may have food and clothing. Certainly he is entitled to at least a few of the comforts and conveniences now enjoyed by his brothers in the cities. The way to provide this comfort is through rural electrification.

Every dollar spent by REA is an investment in the future of America.

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to say merely that down in my section of Mississippi my people do not share in the great flood-control projects of the hill sections; we did not reap the financial benefits of the war-production programs that have been going on. We are a rural area, composed largely of small-home and farm owners. They had the initiative and ingenuity to make their living without government assistance before they would go on the relief rolls during depression.

If you want to centralize your entire population from the rural areas to the cities, where your housing problems are so desperate, just continue as you are going in this bill—fail to electrify the homes in the rural sections of the country. If you want to encourage people to go back to the farms and in the rural sections, give them cheap electric power and roads. Then you will have no trouble about your population having concentrated in the cities where they give so much trouble.

The people in my State have had deposits up for 6 years and have looked forward to the day when the war would be over so that they might have their homes electrified. That same thing is

true throughout the country. They expect, and are entitled to, the comforts and benefits of electricity.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, this is not a gift; this is a loan, and the Government cannot lose. The Government is taking no chance in providing funds to continue and extend rural electrification.

This amendment should pass; it is an investment in America's future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have taken quite a bit of time in the consideration of this bill, but, being a member of this subcommittee, I regret that our distinguished chairman saw fit to limit debate and that I have such a short time to discuss such an important subject as rural electrification. The majority members of this committee said that they would grant approximately all of the funds that were requested for loans, but then cut the administrative expenses by about one-third. Actually, it has been stated here that the reduction in loan authority of $25,000,000 will mean the elimination next year of 135,000 miles of rural lines. I say to you the Republican members of this committee have seriously hampered the expansion of this program when they cut down the administrative expense. Every move in the construction of a line clears through the administration of this agency in Washington. From the time the application is made and the engineers of the national agency go over the application and make the survey until the line is actually constructed, the matter is under administrative authority.

The amount of administrative funds as approved by the House would result in reduction of almost 30 percent in the personnel of the agency. This reduction would sharply retard the progress of rural electrification on the eve of what would otherwise be the year of greatest accomplishment in the history of the program. Specifically, the House reduction would:

A. Restrict loan allocations to those projects requiring least preliminary investigation.

B. Retard construction.

C. Decrease the Administration's ability to protect the Government's $1,000,000,000 investment in existing systems.

The work of the Rural Electrification Administration, including the staff divisions as well as the line divisions with field personnel, may be classified into the three following general categories:

First. Making loans.

Second. Building lines.

Third. Protecting the Government's investment.

PROGRAM IN 1948 COMPARED WITH PREWAR PEAK YEARS

Although the staff of the agency would be reduced by the House bill from the present number of 1,100 to approximately 775, or slightly more than the average employment during the years of 1939 and 1940, the program of the agency in 1948, as shown by the following figures, will be at least three times as large as the average of 1939 and 1940, the prewar peak years.

| | Average of 1939 and 1940 | Estimated 1948 | Excess of 1939 and 1940 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Pct.* |
| Loan authorizations | $90,000,000 | $225,000,000 | 150 |
| Consumers connected per year | 222,500 | 535,000 | 140 |
| Total consumers connected | 403,800 | 2,454,000 | 510 |
| Advance of funds | 80,500,000 | 340,000,000 | 320 |
| Total investments | 171,600,000 | 1,065,000,000 | 520 |
| Number of REA personnel | 735 | 775 | 5 |

The above table discloses how the 1948 program is vastly greater than that of 1939 and 1940. For example:

First. The loan authorization is $135,000,000 greater.

Second. More than twice as many consumers should be connected during 1948.

Third. Four times as much money will be advanced—a quarter of a billion dollar increase.

Fourth. Not only are the lending and construction activities vastly greater than in 1939 and 1940, but also the activities concerned with safeguarding and servicing the Government investment are multiplied sixfold.

Notwithstanding the administrative demands of the largest program REA has faced, the House bill provides a reduction of the existing staff from approximately 1,100 to about 775. This compares with an average of 735 who carried out the much smaller program in 1939 and 1940.

EFFECT OF HOUSE REDUCTION ON THE 1948 PROGRAM

Specifically, the effect of the reduction in administrative funds as passed by the House would be reflected in the three major functions of the agency as follows:

Loans: There is insistant demand for electric service throughout every part of the Nation but in order to loan the $225,000,000 passed by the House, with a sharp reduction in the REA staff, it will be necessary to make rather radical departures from the present pattern of loan operations.

Obviously, it will be necessary to reduce sharply the amount of time and effort spent in reviewing loan applications. Therefore, by force of circumstance, loans will tend to be concentrated in those areas where the least intensive analysis is required to determine economic feasibility of the project. That will mean that the bulk of the loans will go to the older, better established borrowers in the economically most favored areas. It will simply be necessary to lay aside applications from borrowers in areas where any additional effort is required in order to determine the feasibility of the loan. In other words the development of rural electrification, under the program resulting from the House action, would not be on a truly national basis.

Construction: The labor and material situation is improving almost daily. Given an adequate administrative staff with which to function, the 1948 construction program would surpass by a wide margin any previous records for the construction of rural power lines. It has been estimated that with our present staff it would be possible to complete the construction of 198,000 miles of line in 1948. With staff reductions amounting to almost 30 percent, it is estimated that it will not be possible to complete more than 150,000 miles in 1948. Every single step in the construction program, from approval of the original plans and specifications through inspection of construction to final advance of funds for completed work, will be slowed up. These are jobs that must be done. To adopt any other course would be costly and unwise. For instance, simply to reduce the amount of engineering assistance and supervision would mean that the Government would be investing funds in electric systems which might or might not be adequately designed to serve as the basis for a self-liquidating loan.

Specifically, a reduction of nearly 30 percent in the number of field and office engineers of the agency will:

First. Delay the approval of plans and specifications, engineering contracts, material contracts, construction contracts, and the supervision of construction progress in the field. The result will be to slow down construction and the connection of new consumers by about 25 percent, and to seriously delay the advance of funds with which borrowers meet their bills to both contractors and material suppliers. In addition, construction costs will be higher because the reduced engineering staff will not be able to make sufficiently detailed cost studies and reviews of system designs to obtain lowest construction and operating costs.

Second. Delay the approval of plans which the cooperatives prepare to meet the many technical operating problems growing out of the greater demands for power which farm people are placing on their utility systems. These include such problems as sectionalizing studies, voltage regulations, rephasing, increasing substation capacity, and so forth.

Third. Delay progress in the construction of generating facilities in parts of the country where power is rationed at the present time or where it is impossible to connect new consumers because of inadequate power supplies.

Protecting the Government investment: In addition to spearheading the largest construction program in history during 1948, REA also will have the responsibility for servicing and otherwise safeguarding a billion dollars worth of Government funds invested in nearly 1,000 utility systems operating in 46 States and two of the Territories. The real security of the Government in these systems is based on satisfactory and efficient operation of the properties. The great bulk of these loans has been made to farmer cooperatives whose actual experience in the electric utility business is limited wholly to that gained from operations ranging from a few months to at most about 10 years. Although it is the policy of REA to withdraw its counsel and advice as rapidly as its borrowers can efficiently cope with their management and operating problems, the facts in the case are, that the multifarious problems arising from the rapid growth

of the cooperatives during the last few years is confronting even the most experienced with circumstances in which they need specialized assistance of a kind they can obtain only from REA.

The average REA-financed system will, in 1948, represent an investment of more than $1,000,000 with approximately 800 miles of line serving 2,500 members. Furthermore, in the all-out effort of the last dozen years to get power lines to as many farm people as possible, many of the problems concerned with long-time sound management and the financial welfare of the cooperative have had to be deferred and are now calling for REA attention.

A reduction of nearly 30 percent in the REA staff will reduce the management assistance available to the cooperative to such a point that personnel will not be available in many cases where positive action is necessary to prevent jeopardy of the Government's loan, nor will it be possible to provide the assistance which might prevent such situations from arising. Audits of borrowers' records, which constitute a basic security for this billion-dollar investment, would be so sharply reduced that we would be able to make an adequate check on the financial status of our borrowers on an average of about once every 2 years, whereas good business practice requires more frequent audits. Advice and counsel on such matters as labor relations, training of system personnel, cooperative organization and system appraisal will have to be drastically curtailed.

With the present REA staff—all included, administrative, professional, and clerical—there is an average of only about one person to administer relations with a million-dollar borrower. Under the House bill this would be reduced nearly 30 percent.

Do not kid yourselves when you fail to provide sufficient funds for the administration of the REA. You restrict the program and you are responsible for thousands of farm families being delayed in receiving electricity. You will have prevented them from finding their lot a little easier; their lives a little brighter.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted and the authorization for loans to Rural Electrification Administration will be increased. In my own district, and I am sure the same situation exists in all parts of the country, there is a great backlog of applications pending for the extension of rural electrification lines. The amount allowed by the committee will not begin to take up the applications already filed.

If a gift of money were being asked for the various rural electrification co-ops, then I could well understand the opposition of the committee. But even so, just for the sake of argument, let us say that it is a gift. It is my contention that it would be good business even as a gift on the part of the Government of the United States for three reasons:

First. It would greatly encourage our free-enterprise system because with the extension of electric energy, the addition of each new home and service would increase the demand for refrigerators, washing machines, stoves, heaters, and many other items in the home, thus affording free enterprise an opportunity to manufacture and sell additional items, thereby adding to their revenue and ability to serve.

Second. It would encourage the faith of the people in the country which they love.

Third. It would bring money into the Treasury of the United States by increasing production and encouraging industry with the incident increase in taxes paid in

As I say, even if it were a gift, it would be good business on the part of the Congress.

However, it is not contemplated that this money be a gift. It is only an authorization for loans to the cooperatives to extend their services to the people who have waited so long for such service. It has been the happy experience of the Rural Electrification Administration that these loans have been good loans, and they are being repaid with interest and many times repaid ahead of due date.

In addition to the interest which the Government receives from the money it loans, it increases its wealth by reason of the taxes collected. The little cooperative which serves my home section paid more than $9,000 in taxes last year, in addition to the interest which it paid to the Government on its loans.

We hear a lot these days about subversive activities. If we want to kill off subversive activities, the best thing we can do is to make our people happy and make our own fine system work. I know of no single better way to do it than to let the cooperatives have all the money they need. I mean all they need, to extend electric energy to every home and to every small industry that does not have it now.

I shall vote for the amendment because I believe it is true economy, even looking at it in a cold-blooded, dollars-and-cents manner.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to register my protest against the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee to decrease the funds for the maintenance, operation, and expansion of the Rural Electrification Administration during the coming fiscal year. We all realize that the demands of war brought to a temporary halt the activities of REA, and while this agency is still confronted with the handicap of material shortages the prospect of obtaining these needed materials is considerably brighter now than it has been during the course of the past several years. To stultify the expansion of the activities of REA at this time would be a definite set-back to the progress and welfare of the American farmer and to agriculture generally. This is not the time to cut back the rural electrification program—now is not the time to reduce REA loan funds by $25,000,000 nor to slash by nearly 30 percent the funds for REA administrative purposes, as proposed in the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947–48.

Every Member of this House who has accorded any study to the background and operations of the Rural Electrification Administration understands and appreciates that the activities of this agency developed out of the needs of the American farmer and his family. Rural electrification means the transfer of a good share of the burden of manual labor, entailed in the operation of a farm, to the power-driven farm equipment which spares not only the backs and muscles of the farm family but makes for greater efficiency and increased agricultural production.

Twenty years ago only 3 percent of the 6,000,000 farms in this country had electricity; 10 years ago just slightly more than 10 percent of these farms had electricity. Why? Because the privately owned commercial power companies could not operate on a profitable basis in rural areas located beyond the immediate vicinity of cities and towns. The Government's answer to the problem of bringing electricity to the American farmer and his family is REA, which is the agency through which Federal credit is extended for rural electrification, thus enabling our farm population to organize and operate its own power systems. The Rural Electrification Administration operates no electrical facilities but is merely the Federal facility through which rural electrification is made possible through Government loans to cooperatives, public utility districts, municipalities, or power companies to finance electric generation, transmission, and distribution facilities in order to bring electricity to farm families too far removed to receive commercial central station electric service. In addition to loans to local farmer cooperatives and other borrowers, the Rural Electrification Administration provides technical advice, engineering assistance, legal advice, and a standardized accounting system to its borrowers. The REA program is on a thoroughly sound financial basis; all loans are self-liquidating, at an interest rate of 2 percent over an amortization period of 35 years. Less than one-half of 1 percent of all REA loans are delinquent.

Despite confusing and biased arguments to the contrary, the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration present no real issues between private and public power because they are not in competition; REA services a clientele that, in the main, the privately owned commercial power companies cannot reach. That statement is borne out by the fact that at the inception of the REA program it was hoped and believed that the commercial power companies would take the initiative in the rural-electrification program, but this hope proved to

be ungrounded in that out of $100,000,000 made available for this program in 1935 the commercial power companies borrowed less than $1,000,000, which conclusively proved that the problem of rural electrification was not going to be solved by the privately owned utility companies; instead, it became obvious that the farmers themselves, in cooperation with the Federal Government, would have to take the lead. Rural electric cooperatives began springing up throughout the entire country, and their activities during the past 10 years have definitely established that the nonprofit farmer cooperative is the answer to the problem of rural electrification.

The Rural Electrification Act specifically requires that 50 percent of the funds available for lending purposes in each year be allocated to the States "in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central-station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service." Thus in every State borrowers are guaranteed an opportunity to borrow on a fair and proportionate basis for the development of rural electrification.

Congress annually fixes the limit of REA's lending authority for each fiscal year and directs the lending of funds within that set limitation. This annual loan fund has ranged from $10,000,000 to as high as $300,000,000. Unfortunately, in this bill it is proposed that REA have $25,000,000 less during the coming fiscal year with which to make loans.

As of April 1, 1947, REA had approved loans totalling $1,010,037,390 to 1,011 borrowers, of which 931 were cooperatives, 40 were public utility districts, 20 were other public bodies, and 20 were commercial power companies. These borrowers were operating 524,161 miles of lines serving 1,754,073 farms and other rural consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands.

About 80 percent of the consumers on REA-financed lines are farms, the remainder being nonfarm rural homes, churches, schools, community halls, stores and a variety of rural industries, such as creameries, grain elevators, wood-working plants, machinery repair shops, quarries, and so forth. The stimulation of rural industry is not by any means the least of the contributions of the REA program to rural welfare.

In my own State of Kentucky, the first REA loan was approved in October 1935. Prior to that time, only 8,480 Kentucky farms, or 3 percent of all the farms in the State had central station electric service. According to estimates, based on the 1940 census, 32.1 percent or 76,650 Kentucky farms now have electricity. As of April 1, 1947, the 26 Kentucky REA borrowers, all of whom are cooperatives, were operating 16,327 miles of power lines and serving 69,582 rural consumers. As of April 1, 1947, our Kentucky rural electric cooperatives had received REA loan approvals totalling $35,042,355; of this amount, $19,019,853 had actually been advanced for construction projects. Our REA borrowers had paid $3,966,908 of the principal and interest on their loans, including $600,197 repaid on principal before it was due.

Kentucky, which is basically an agricultural State, has benefited under the REA program, but the job of rural electrification there, like elsewhere, is not as yet completed by any means. While great progress has been made, approximately 3,000,000 American farms, of which 162,157 are in Kentucky, still lack electricity. The goal is electric service to every one of these potential rural consumers and REA is now on the threshold of its greatest opportunity to spread the convenience of electricity to every farm family in the Nation. Let us take advantage of the opportunity and complete the job. Let us restore the full REA appropriation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

[Mr. HAYS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the few minutes which have been allotted to me will not permit a full discussion of the many objectional features of this measure. Hence I must limit my observations to specific examples where this unwise slash in appropriations will cause great harm to the State of Minnesota and to my district.

In the first place, I want to go on record as being wholeheartedely against the cut in the funds of the Rural Electrification Administration. In my opinion, the present rural electrification program is doing about as much for the American farmer as anything else that has ever been attempted by the Federal Government. Millions of our farm housewives have benefited from the REA in that it provides electric energy for cooking, heating, ironing, washing, and many other of the numerous household tasks which would otherwise be drudgery. It has benefited the daily operations of the farmer by providing cheap energy for pumping, elevating, mixing, and so forth. Life has become more productive, pleasant, and worthwhile for the people, living on 52.9 percent of the farms in the country as a result of rural electrification.

This measure, which proposes to cut $1,600,000 from the administrative expenses of the REA, and $25,000,000 from its loan authorization, is certain to have detrimental effects upon the REA program. In the first place, this cut will mean that many applications for loans by farm cooperatives now pending must be rejected for lack of funds. Just last week I received a telegram from the Carlton County Cooperative Power Association, Carlton County, Minn., protesting this cut in funds. This association has 850 members, of whom only 260 members have been receiving the benefits of electric power. Recently the association made application for a loan for the purpose of building 246 miles of power line in order to provide the same service to its other 500 members. If this cut is to stand, these good people are to be deprived indefinitely of rural electrification.

This is not an isolated example. Farm cooperatives all over the United States will be unable to go forward with their REA program if the House upholds this proposed slash. In fact, the REA needs some $361,000,000 for the 1948 fiscal year to meet its lending requirements—the $225,000,000 provided in this bill will not even begin to cover application for loans now pending.

This slash is a crushing blow to the hopes of millions of American farmers who desire the advantages of rural electrification. As I stated before, about 53 percent of all farmers in America are today enjoying the benefits of rural electrification. I maintain that we should make it 100 percent—we should expand and extend the rural electrification to cover every farm in the United States, large or small.

May I remind my colleagues that this slash in REA funds cannot be considered an expenditure in the first place. For most of the REA funds are used to make loans to farm cooperatives, which are paid back to the Government from their earnings. In other words, REA funds represent an investment rather than a Government expenditure, and to slash thees fuds in no way repreests an economy.

This reduction in the REA funds is but part of the general pattern of false economies whereby the proponents of this bill are able to cut the heart out of the entire farm program. Although it has been estimated that $300,000,000 is needed for the AAA conservation program, the appropriations for this program have been cut by $100,000,000 down to a total of only $150,000,000. At the same time the crop insurance program is reduced by $8,000,000; the Farmers Home Administration by $55,000,000; and the Production and Marketing Administration by $27,000,000. Thus the Federal farm program is drastically curtailed—functior by function—through the indiscriminate use of the economy ax.

A second example of false economy is found in the proposed reduction in the funds for the school hot-lunch program. You will recall that the Seventy-ninth Congress appropriated $75,000,000 for this program for the 1947 fiscal year. You will also remember that this appropriation was inadequate and that it was necessary to make a deficiency appropriation of $6,000,000 to carry the program from March 31 to the end of the current school year. Even this total of $81,000,000 for the present fiscal year was far from adequate, and that the estimated annual fiscal needs for this service is approximately $120,000,000.

In the face of these facts, the majority now proposes to reduce the appropriations for the national school-lunch program to $45,000,000 for the 1948 fiscal year—a slash of 40 percent. The effect of such a cut is that funds for this purpose will be exhausted by January 31, 1948, and the program will go by default at that time.

I have always favored Government economy, but it is not economical to sacrifice the health and well-being of our children. I maintain that expenditures for food for our school children is a sound investment as they contribute to the building of a healthy citizenry for tomorrow. I call upon my colleagues to subordinate their desire to reduce taxes for the benefit of the wealthy, and restore this budget cut and thus make possible the conservation of America's most precious natural resources—our children.

Another instance of irresponsible budget slashing is found in the reduction of the funds of the United States Forest Service. The lumber and pulpwood industry is an important one in my State of Minnesota, and these industries will suffer from this slash. To slash the national forest protection and management expenditures by over $1,500,000 is bound to hurt the forest conservation program. The proposed one-half millon dollars reduction in the funds needed for forest research means that our efforts to discover new uses for forest products will have to be curtailed.

Let me give you a concrete example of the effect of this slash in the United States Forest Service budget. A few months ago 400 veterans of World War II living in the city of Ely, Minn., pooled their resources and or anized a pulp-manufacturing business. The name of the firm is GI Inc. Before the firm can begin production, an RFC loan is required. At the present time all initial stages in securing this loan have been passed; the only remaining condition in qualifying for this loan is an official survey regarding the forest resources in the area.

Now we find the hopes and plans of these 400 GI's being jeopardized as a result of this cut by one-half million dollars in the funds needed for forest-resources investigations. These veterans cannot get their RFC loan without this official survey, and there can be no such survey without adequate appropriations.

As the House Committee on Agriculture states in its report on this bill, "the appropriation of funds must be geared to some kind of basic philosophy." This is an obvious truth. But the big question is, To what kind of a basic philosophy? I say certainly not one that gives so little assistance to those who need it so much.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

[Mr. MONRONEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments to increase the funds for the Rural Electrification program because of the need which exists and the necessity to get this program under way. Due to the war, materials have been scarce and necessary building of lines has not been done. Surely now, when we have access to materials, we should proceed with this program as rapidly as possible. It is hard to understand why this Appropriations Committee is so loathe to grant sufficient funds to bring cheap power to rural America. The REA program has done more than any other single factor to bring happiness and security to our farm families and I hope the House will grant the added funds.

When we consider that a country like Japan is 90 percent electrified and the United States only 52 percent electrified we should pause to wonder. My own State is only approximately 35 percent electrified and I am looking forward to the day when Montana and the Nation will be completely electrified—cheaply and satisfactorily. It is one of the answers to the security which all America craves and all America deserves. I hope the Republican steam roller will not smother this worthy amendment as it has consistently and unanimously done on every amendment considered to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

[Mr. RAYBURN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Texas. The distinguished gentleman and minority leader from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and REA has no better friend on this floor than the gentleman from Washington now addressing you. However, I want to call your attention to the fact that every amount for loans in the President's budget is in this bill. But I want to remind you that a year ago we appropriated money for rivers and harbors. we appropriated for reclamation and War Department civil functions, we appropriated money for airports, we appropriated money for REA and other civil functions, for the construction of more or less public works, and after we went home the President, using the excuse that they were inflationary and made too much construction for this country, froze those funds, and over $400,000,000 of those funds are still frozen. Now, there are in allocations and loan grants in this bill, half a billion dollars for REA. I rejoice that that is true. But, if we are to break the President's budget, and go over it by action on these amendments I ask you in all honesty, what expectation have we that the President will not again, in the name of the inflation that he only 2 weeks ago showed he was fearful of, freeze those funds in the name of a sensible program for fiscal 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it might be expected that on a subject like REA there would be a little more light and a little less heat. I have great affection for the gentleman from Mississippi, but the fact of the matter is that he is greatly mistaken. Now, we might just as well be honest about it. Yesterday he used the figure here of $361,000,000 in demands for power, and where did he get it?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not going to yield at this point.

I will tell you where that figure came from, and I do not yield, Mr. Chairman. There are over here in the files of the Committee on Appropriations the questionnaires that a former Democratic Member of Congress by the name of Clyde Ellis sent out to all the cooperatives, and there he dumped on our desk in the hearing room all of the questionnaires, and the aggregate is $361,000,000. That is the figure that shows up in the mimeographed letter that came to the desk of nearly every Member of Congress this week.

Now, then, what is in them? Well, we went to the trouble to analyze them. Here is a request for a line to cost $6,000 a mile in Tennessee, when the Federal Power Commission told us that the average cost was $1,500. Here is a request to build a line of 115 miles to serve 62 consumers. There are 600 of those questionnaires lying over there. That is where they got this estimate. We have been more than generous with the REA, and you should vote this amendment down. They have more money than they need right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 106, noes 141.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PHILLIPS of California and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 144, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be subject to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out lines 24 and 25 on page 71, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 72 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 612 (c)), not more than $40,000,000 shall be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, for use in effectuating the purposes of that act. The remainder of the fund appropriated by said act for the fiscal year 1948 is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately thereafter."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that the point of order be made now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota will state the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know exactly what the amendment proposes to do. Obviously, it proposes to amend existing law. I may not want to insist upon the point of order if I can hear it explained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, whether or not the point of order is made will determine the action of the committee. I prefer that the point of order be disposed of at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I think in order to protect the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] ought to reserve his point of order or make it now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I expect to see the point of order made now and disposed of, because it will have some bearing on our future action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have received some explanation of the amendment and I do not insist on the point of order, and I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment after consultation with the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and as many of the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations as I could discuss it with, and it seems to be agreeable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you conferred with the members of the subcommittee on the Democratic side?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. As a matter of fact, we were not departing from the committee position and I rather imagine the Committee on Agriculture discussed it with some members on that side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

I would like to know what the parliamentary situation is. Has the gentleman reserved his point of order, or not?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman from South Dakota has withdrawn the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if it is in order to be heard at this time, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentlemen on this side particularly, that from section 32 funds, as they were originally sent down, $100,000,000 of the estimated $148,000,000 would have been used for AAA payments. The committee today having reduced the AAA payments, provided for such payments as will be made by direct appropriations, and the $100,000,000 of the $148,000,000 estimated in section 32 funds, not being needed for that purpose, it means, then, that of $48,000,000 that would have been available if the budget recommendation had been followed, $40,000,000 is made available by the chairman's amendment. In effect, you are getting $40,000,000 out of an estimated $48,000,000 that would have been available for the general purposes of section 32, exclusive of the $100,000,000 that might have gone to the AAA payments.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if that is not a correct statement of his amendment. That is, will the amendment make available $40,000,000 for general section 32 purposes, of the estimated $48,000,000 that would be available?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It would be $40,000,000 out of the estimated $48,000,000 that would be available. The whole amount of customs receipts was estimated at $148,000,000, but in the budget estimate, $100,000,000 was transferred to the conservation and use payments, and the other was earmarked for section 32. This makes provision for $40,000,000 of the $48,000,000 which otherwise would have been stricken entirely from the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman, of course, was not paying attention to my earlier remarks, but they are in line with what the gentleman has said. As far as I am concerned, on this committee I have been vitally interested in the section 32 funds. They have proven one of the greatest bulwarks of safety for the American farmer and while $40,000,000 is not $48,000,000, it will substantially meet the needs of the American people, and I am glad to see the gentleman on the other side see this light at this late hour; and I for one am for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent now that the chairman of the subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Republican members of the subcommittee, forced by the militant fight made by the Democratic members on the subcommittee, concurred in by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and several other members of the Republican Party, has now offered this amendment which will bring some relief to the farmers. The credit for this amendment is entirely due to the militant fight that has been made on the floor of the House yesterday and today by a small group of Republican Members and the entire Democratic membership in the House.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. I wonder if the gentleman is speaking for the farm constituency he has, those concrete farmers in South Boston?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is speaking for the people of South Boston. The gentleman from Massachusetts has supported all farm legislation. The gentleman from Massachusetts spoke for the first Bankhead cotton quota act which was the first piece of farm legislation years ago that passed this House by six or seven votes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has consistently voted for farm legislation, and I have done it because I do not think I should view these questions from a sectional angle, and that while I am serving a congressional district here I feel that it is my duty to represent the national interest of the people as a whole.

So in answer to the gentleman whose kindly but wise inquiry was made, the gentleman who represents South Boston—and I represent the people of that district with pride—answers in the affirmative that in making my remarks I am expressing the views of the people of my district, and there is not one farm located in the district.

A motion to recommit will be made. That motion will include increasing the soil conservation item from $165,000,000 to $300,000,000. I understand it will include an increase for the school lunch program and an increase for the rural electrification program. I have no knowledge of anything else or any other items that may be included therein, but those three matters will be included in the motion to recommit and when the vote is had the farmers of the United States and those interested in this bill can interpret the vote and know that a vote against the motion to recommit is a vote against increasing soil conservation to $300,000,000, is a vote against increasing the school-lunch program to $75,000,000, and is a vote against increasing the rural electrification program.

We now have the practice set in this bill and in the Interior Department bill. In that connection I call the attention of the people of the great Northwest and West to the fact that their hopes are being decimated by the sharp reductions in the appropriations made in the bill by the Republicans and that the control of the Republican Party is in the East. There is an eastern domination of the Republican Party.

This bill conveys to the farmers of the country confirmation of the statement that the Republican Party in making appropriations for the farmers in this bill as they did in making appropriations for the West and Northwest in the Interior

Department bill were dominated by the eastern wing of their party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may be permitted a comment, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is not a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations who comes from east of the Allegheny Mountains.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the corrections may be made that will be submitted to the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the amendment adopted on research, the total be corrected to read "$9,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, during the last session of Congress the OPA Act was repealed. There were cries of anguish from the bureaucrats, who predicted dire results.

Let me analyze what happened: Goods reappeared on the shelves. Our economy started to function. In the first quarter this year our national income increased to the rate of $180,000,000,000. Retail sales in March, according to a report of United States News, reached $107,400,000,000. In addition, the public was consuming more goods than in any period in history.

For the first time since 1930 we have a balanced national budget, full employment, and, at the same time, are able to help in restoring world economic conditions.

That condition was the result of the repeal of the OPA. In my opinion, if the OPA had not been repealed, the predictions of the planners of a national income of $140,000,000,000, with 8,000,000 unemployed, would have come to pass.

Then our Nation would not have been prosperous; we would not have been able to balance the budget and reduce taxes. We would have had a national deficit and an increase in appropriations from a reduced national income.

Next, let us look at present price levels. For the past 30 days the 35 leading raw materials, which determine our income and that of the world, have been practically stabilized at 170 percent of 1926 price levels.

If you will recall the price of gold, which is still the yardstick for international exchange, was increased from $20.67, the 1926 price, to $35 an ounce, also an approximate increase of 170 percent. In other words, our prices during the past 30 days have been at par with the only monetary yardstick at the present time.

The farmer is being blamed for high prices and a campaign has been on for weeks to get his price down. At the present time farm marketings are 140 percent of the 1930–39 averages and from the same number of farm acres. The result of this 140-percent farm production times the price at present is the reason for $180,000,000,000 of national income.

Supposing because of controls and the shortage of farm labor, fertilizer, farm machinery, and possibly weather conditions our farm production drops back to 1930–39 levels, what will be the result? Our national income even with present price levels would be approximately $140,000,000,000, we would have unemployment and a return of national deficits.

Let me say to some of my fellow Members of Congress from the Eastern States, you are still following the plan. For each $1 of farm income the national income will be $7, and if his price or production drops you are going to suffer in direct proportion.

Therefore, whether you represent labor, manufacturing, or finance you should be seriously concerned about the farmers' welfare.

There is plenty of evidence of a desire to break down our farm income. Although Congress repealed the OPA the planners are using their controls over exports and imports as price control.

Under the Constitution Congress was given the right to control our domestic and foreign commerce. But, through the Trade Agreements Act and War Powers Act, Congress gave its control away.

The planners are now thinking in terms of an International Trade Organization which can tell the farmer what to plant, the price he is to receive and how much can be sold to other nations. Then there will be no need for Congress.

A good illustration of what is happening to our price structure can be illustrated by the price of lard.

Because of OPA restrictions and confusion our hog numbers on January 1, 1947 had dropped to 1939 levels. We had a good corn crop and the farmer using the hog as a factory fed to heavier weights, thus giving us both more meat and lard.

For this contribution to our food supply and national income he is now being penalized. Allocations for exports of fats and oils have prevented shipments to the hungry in Europe.

The result has been a piling up of lard in storage. In addition with control of tariffs they have permitted imports of fats and oils to help depress lard still further. And, in addition to that they have been carrying on a program for our housewives to save grease for soap.

What does it all add up to? Because of this control, according to a news item from the Chicago market, heavy hogs have dropped in price $6 to $10 per hundred-weight. The farmer in many cases suffered a loss in trying to produce food.

Quoting for the same article, "despite increased output and the heaviest accumulation of lard in 3 years, exports under Federal control in the first quarter of 1947 were 11 percent below the same period in 1946 and 54 percent below 2 years ago.

They have led the American people to believe that they need these controls to feed the world and that they must have these controls under the War Powers Act—an emergency measure.

In my opinion these controls are preventing food from reaching the hungry in other nations and the record proves this contention.

In the first 3 months this year we exported approximately $614,000,000 worth of food. We imported $421,000,000. In this 3-month period our exports were less than the first 3 months of 1946. On the other hand, our imports of food increased 36.7 percent over the same period in 1946.

On the basis of the record for the first 3 months of 1947 our total food exports will be approximately $2,500,000,000, with imports practically equaling exports by the end of the year.

With an estimated export total of $13,000,000,000, food products will be about 19 percent.

This ought to illustrate how these controls are being used to benefit the large industries through the foreign loans which we have been making.

As a Member of Congress I am warning you that we are permitting the destruction of our agricultural economy—the foundation of our national income.

It is just a matter of months until the control over exports and low prices for fats and oils will bring on the depression which the planners have been predicting and seem to want.

I do not want another depression and if it is to be prevented Congress must act to regain its constitutional power to control domestic and foreign commerce.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation of the courtesy and consideration shown the minority by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I count it a privilege to have served under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois. Within my membership on that subcommittee we have never had a chairman of greater ability and more sincere devotion to the real interests of agriculture and the Nation.

I am certain, I violate no confidence when I say that in the event of the misfortune of having a President in the White House of his political affiliation he would unquestionably be a member of the President's Cabinet—and if within the next 6 or 10 years is entirely within the realm of possibility that he would appoint the Cabinet himself.

In anticipation of such happy auspices, I want to take the precaution of now entering application for special consideration. The President of the United States has the duty of appointing some to desirable positions carefully chosen Members of the opposite party on bipartisan and nonpartisan commissions.

May I here take advantage of this occasion to petition:

"Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

Mr. Chairman, one of the fairest provisions of our system of procedure is the rule for the motion to recommit. The minority is necessarily at a disadvantage. For example, on one amendment which was offered today a change of six votes would have carried the proposition, a very important one; still, we have no opportunity of getting a record vote on it in the Committee of the Whole.

So the rules provide that the minority may offer one motion to recommit in order to secure a record vote on what they may consider to be the essential features of their program.

We will offer a motion to recommit which will comprise three very simple provisions. It will submit three amendments. The first amendment will be for $300,000,000 for the AAA, and nothing else, just the $300,000,000 for AAA. The second amendment will ask $75,000,000 for school lunches, and nothing else, just the $75,000,000 for school lunches. And the third will provide $250,000,000 for REA.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, a vote for the motion to recommit will be a vote for AAA, for school lunches, and for REA. A vote against that motion to recommit will be a vote against the farmers, the farm family, and the hungry children of America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 48, line 26, strike out "$165,614,290" and insert in lieu thereof, "$300,000,000."

On page 52, line 23, strike out "$45,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000", and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 25.

On page 61, line 6, strike out the figure "$225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$250,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 180, answered "present" 4, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—174

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Almond
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Bonner
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Burleson
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Clark
Clements
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
Lemke
Lesinski
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Md.
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
O'Brien
O'Konski
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Peden
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rankin
Rayburn
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Sheppard
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Spence
Stanley
Stigler
Stratton
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—180

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Arnold
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Dague
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dondero
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Foote
Fulton
Gamble
Gearhart
Gillette
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Calif.
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mitchell
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Nodar
Norblad
Owens
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Springer
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Angell
Bennett, Mich.
Case, S. Dak.
Kersten, Wis.

NOT VOTING—71

Andresen, August H.
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Bland
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Brophy
Buckley
Byrne, N. Y.
Curtis
Davis, Wis.

Dingell
Eaton
Ellis
Elston
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Gavin
Gifford
Gillie
Grant, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hagen
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hess
Hinshaw
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Johnson, Ind.
Jonkman
Kearney
Keefe
Kelley
Kilburn
McDowell
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Merrow
Miller, Nebr.
Morrison
Morton
Nixon
Norrell
Norton
O'Hara
Peterson
Pfeifer
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Powell
Rabin
Rayfiel
Redden
Riley
Sadowski
Scoblick
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Shafer
Smith, Kans.
Somers
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Weichel
West

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Bakewell against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Towe against.

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Rayfiel for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. McDowell against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Vail against.

Mr. Somers for, with Mr. Brophy against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Fletcher against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Ellston against.

Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio against.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Ellis for, with Mr. Merrow against.

Mr. Angell for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Case of South Dakota for, with Mr. Jonkman against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.

Mr. Rabin for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. Peterson for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. West for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Miller of Nebraska against.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. SHAFER. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was announced as being paired with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. JONKMAN would have voted "nay" had he been present. Under the circumstances I should have my vote recorded as "yea" and then withdraw it and vote "present."

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GIFFORD. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. GRANT. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and naps.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 315, nays 38, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—315

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buck
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Burke
Burleson
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Carroll
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clements
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Courtney
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Crow
Cunningham
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Fenton
Fernandez
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gearhart
Gillette
Goff
Goodwin
Gore
Gossett
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Hedrick
Hendricks
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kennedy
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
McConnell
McCormack
McCowen
McDonough
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Macy
Mahon
Maloney
Mansfield, Mont.
Martin, Iowa
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nodar
Norblad
Owens
Pace
Passman
Patterson
Peden
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Priest
Rains
Ramey
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tollefson
Trimble
Twyman
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Worley
Youngblood
Zimmerman

NAYS—38

Blatnik
Buchanan
Cannon
Celler
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Eberharter
Feighan
Fogarty
Gordon
Gorski
Hart
Havenner
Hobbs
Holifield
Huber
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Karsten, Mo.
Kefauver
Keogh
King
Kirwan
Lesinski
Lynch
Madden
Manasco
Marcantonio
Miller, Calif.
O'Brien
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patman
Poage
Price, Ill.
Rooney
Sabath
Smith, Ohio

NOT VOTING—76

Andresen, August H.
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Bland
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Brophy
Buckley
Byrne, N. Y.
Chadwick
Cox
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dingell
Eaton
Ellis
Elston
Fellows
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Gavin
Gifford
Gillie
Grant, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hagen
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hess
Hinshaw
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Johnson, Ind.
Jonkman
Kearney
Keefe
Kelley
Kilburn
Klein
McDowell
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Merrow
Miller, Nebr.
Morrison
Morton
Nixon
Norrell
Norton
O'Hara
Peterson
Pfeifer
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Powell
Rabin
Rayburn
Rayfiel
Redden
Riley
Sadowski
Scoblick
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Shafer
Smith, Kans.
Somers
Towe
Vail
Wadsworth
Weichel
West

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Johnson of Indiana for, with Mr. Rabin against.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Bakewell for, with Mr. Somers against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. West.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.
Mr. Jonkman with Mr. Peterson.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Gillie with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Fletcher with Mr. Cox.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BARKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held in the city of Camden last night on the subject Jewish Rights in Palestine.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include brief data.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the committee today and include copy of a grand-jury report and copy of telegrams.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from News Week magazine. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $228.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very inspiring eulogy.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend and revise the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain statistics and data on rural electrification.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a communication received from Frederick C. McKee, of Pittsburgh, on the Mundt bill to authorize the State Department to continue its short-wave broadcasts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. DIRKSEN) was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subject matters.

Mr. MACY (at the request of Mr. DIRKSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, DOUGHTON, and COOPER.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I was immensely pleased this afternoon to learn that Mr. Boleslaus J. Monkiewicz, of New Britain, Conn., was named by Attorney General Clark as a member of the parole board.

I am sure that this appointment will also be good news to the Members of this House, especially Mr. Monkiewicz' former colleagues on the Judiciary Committee with whom he served with distinction during the Seventy-sixth Congress, and to his former colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee with whom he served so eminently during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

During these two terms in the House of Representatives, Attorney Monkiewicz represented the At-Large District of Connecticut, the same district I am privileged to represent in this Congress.

It was my good fortune and a genuine pleasure to refer to this new member of the parole board as my "chief" or "boss," the affable term by which secretaries on the Hill refer to Members of Congress, for I was a secretary on his office staff for 40 months of his combined two terms until I took leave to go on active duty with the Navy.

Mr. Monkiewicz' fine family background, excellent character, legal training and practice, fairness, consideration of others, ability to cooperate with others, wide knowledge of human behavior, eminently fit him for the position to which he has been appointed today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. BROPHY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3029. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

715. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 30, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Greenwich Harbor, Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 272); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

716. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Rock Hall (Rockhall) Harbor, Kent County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

717. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 31, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey for flood control at the city of Tucson, Ariz., and vicinity, in accordance with the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938, which authorizes a preliminary examination and survey of Gila River and tributaries, Arizona and New Mexico (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

718. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Little Sioux River, Iowa, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 275); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Report No. 383 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 673. A bill to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3149. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3398. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3629. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost of for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; with an amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2314. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said act to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates; with an amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1845. A bill to amend section 371, title 10, United States Code (military leave for Federal employees); with an amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3645. A bill relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3646. A bill to provide equitable relief to contractors supplying dairy products to armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3647. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3648. A bill to amend section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 3649. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3650. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, as amended, to establish a conclusive presumption of service incurrence of tropical diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3651. A bil to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 3652. A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain temporary housing and facilities to educational institutions, States and political subdivisions thereof, local public agencies, and nonprofit organizations having possession of such housing and facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3653. A bill allowing a credit against the additional estate tax for inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes paid to any State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3654. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 526, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3655. A bill to provide for the selection and elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3656. A bill to permit holders of bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to assign such bonds for the purpose of making payment on certain loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3657. A bill to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3658. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to the definition of the term "security" contained therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3659. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3660. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission in order to provide for the making of plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3661. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to assist in the establishment in Minneapolis, Minn., of a home and recreational center for American Indian girls; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refuse passage of H. R. 2876, creating a Redwood National Park and a national forest area in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Col. W. M. Chubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 3663. A bill for the relief of Luke Mauriello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3664. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Zagrodny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Adam Stefan Hawrylak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninette M. Porcella*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3667. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

581. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of John W. Goodwin and 41 other citizens of Cass and Bowie Counties, Tex., favoring the passage

undertake this itself but that if I would contribute $300 per month, he would provide 15 minute broadcasting time 5 days a week. I arranged for an Italian newspaper man in New York to prepare the scripts which were mailed to Boston, where Professor Salvimini and others of the Italian Department of Harvard delivered the broadcasts over WRUL.

After Italy invaded France, I discontinued the Italian broadcasts and arranged for a French newspaper man in New York to mail scripts to Boston, where members of the French Department of Harvard broadcast them to France, as a means of helping morale and resistance. Letters and direct personal reports from people who heard the broadcasts in France or North Africa demonstrated their influence in those dark days. When Mussolini began to experience some reverses in the fall of 1940, I arranged for a resumption of the Italian broadcasts in addition to the French.

In late 1940, the French scrip-writer brought to me Mr. Stanislav Petrovich, who had broadcast to Yugoslavia from Paris and London, and who asked if I would provide an opportunity for him to broadcast over WRUL. Mr. Petrovich pointed out the stategic importance of encouraging resistance to Yugoslav collaboration if Hitler made a Balkan drive in the spring of 1941. I inquired of friends who had been in Yugoslavia as to how many short wave sets were there and learned that while the number was limited, there was one in almost every cafe and that it was a great country for grapevine. I accordingly arranged for three 15-minute broadcasts per week, Mr. Petrovich making recordings at the Asch Recording Studios at New York, which were mailed to Boston and played over WRUL.

When the revolt against the Collaborationist Yugoslav Government took place in the spring of 1941, I arranged with Mr. Lemmon for Mr. Petrovich to go to Boston at once and broadcast three times a day. At this time, the only other short-wave broadcasts going into Yugoslavia to combat the Nazi broadcasts were some from the British BBC, which the Germans were jamming. I understand that, when communications were cut in Yugoslavia, in many cases the only means by which people in one section could learn of what was going on in other sections was from Mr. Petrovich's broadcasts.

The American Minister in Belgrade later made public statements about the important influence of these broadcasts on the revolt and Mr. Petrovich has described this in detail in his book Free Yugoslavia Calling. While Yugoslavia was overrun in a comparatively short time, Yugoslav resistance delayed Hitler's timetable about six weeks and brought him to the gates of Moscow at the beginning of winter instead of October 1.

Shortly before January 1, 1941, Hans Jacob, a former Germany Army officer, who had broadcast against Hitler as the Voice of Strasbourg,, came to see me. I also made arrangements for him to broadcast recordings being made in New York and mailed to WRUL.

Many more broadcasts were needed but my financial burden had become quite heavy and Mr. Lemmon seemed to be having great difficulty in fund raising. I accordingly interested some friends in giving a luncheon at a club in one of our larger cities at which Mr. Lemmon and I spoke. Although 30 to 40 business leaders were present, having a net personal worth of probably in excess of $100,000,000. I believe that only about $2,500 in contributions was secured.

It is tragic that, while the Nazis were reported to be spending $200,000,000 for world propaganda in 1941, such comparatively insignificant amounts were available for short-wave broadcasting from this country. In 1941, when the Nazis were blanketing the Near East with broadcasts in the various Arab dialects, I asked Mr. Lemmon if he could not arrange for a broadcast in Arabic, but he advised that he knew of no suitable person. I appealed to a diplomatic friend, who located a Syrian rug salesman who had been educated in Beirut and who offered, if his moving expenses were paid to Boston, that he would broadcast without charge and support himself by rug selling. With the Nazis jamming BBC, it was tragic that this should have been the only voice opposing the Nazi Middle East propaganda in 1941.

We are fundamentally engaged in a war of ideas and it will be fatal if we throw away our weapons just because a few errors have been made in a large program. Unless we get the truth to the Russian people, how can we expect them to oppose any aggressive plans which their heirarchy may develop? Today apparently the only way we can get over the Iron Curtain is by the State Department Voice of America shortwave program and other educational activities.

We must also bring the truth to the other peoples in the world whose minds are being poisoned by Soviet propaganda. It is reported that the Soviet has over 1,400 branch headquarters in France alone. The British, in spite of their terrible financial problems, are reported to be spending about twice as much as our Voice of America program and Chile approximately 40 percent as much.

There is ample evidence of the great value of the Voice of America program throughout the world. As one illustration, when the Soviet officials arrested the leader of the Small Landowners' Party in Hungary, and the United States protested, the Soviet prevented the Hungarian papers from publishing the protest. The Voice of America broadcast, however, carried the news of our protest over the iron curtain into Hungary, and within a few days the American Embassy in Budapest received over 10,000 requests for information on our protest. The attacks by Ilya Ehrenburg and other Communists on the Voice of America program is another illustration of its effect and importance.

If ideas sell themselves spontaneously, as some have declared, then the billions of dollars being spent by American business on advertising is being wasted. But we know that the truth must come to men before the truth can make them free.

What would we think of a business enterprise which refused to spend one-tenth of 1 percent of its budget for public relations, which is approximately the ratio of the cost of the State Department Voice of America program to the total Federal budget. This $31,000,000 per year is equal to our cost of only a few hours of the Second World War, yet in the last analysis it may be the most important means of preventing a third world war.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE.

---

## Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1947*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold L. Ickes from the Washington Star:

MAN TO MAN—HOUSEWIVES SHOULD ORGANIZE SUGAR MARCH ON AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

(By Harold L. Ickes)

All over the country fruits and berries are now or soon will be ripening. Housewives are washing up their home canning equipment. They might better be organizing a broom brigade for a march on the Agriculture Department.

A storm may be expected to arise when the housewives discover that they are not going to get any extra sugar for canning this year. Agriculture undoubtedly is perfecting excuses which will quiet the lowering storm. Its arguments will be that sugar is still in short supply, and that transportation is in a state. As a last resort it will make the appeal that anyway the sugar-rationing program was invented by the OPA, and hence is a vestigial remnant which ought to be preserved in a museum.

To meet the expected complaints the sugar officials have granted each person at least 35 pounds of sugar this year, an increase of 10 pounds over last year. But the joker in the proceeding lies in the lack of an extra allowance during the period when fruit is ripening.

COMPLAINTS OF "FAST ONE"

It was persistent complaints about the rationing of sugar that hastened the demise of the OPA and resulted in the present increased allotment to domestic civilian users. But by increasing the yearly allotment the Government has not softened the bitterness arising out of the unpleasant fact that, whereas last summer there was an allowance of an extra 10 pounds for canning, this summer the housewife has been promised a coupon for only 10 pounds of sugar which must last to September 30. It is no wonder that complaints have arisen that the Government has put over a fast one on the home canners for the benefit of the hand-me-down products.

The complaints have come chiefly from the women of the country, largely farm or suburban, who were unable to get sugar for canning last year and, as a result, were compelled to spend high prices for ready-made jellies and preserves. Certainly the complaints that I have received were from those who were thrifty enough to do their own canning and had the means to do so—all except the sugar. Home canning ought to be encouraged. It not only means a lower cost of living, it makes for the well being of the family. Moreover, there are those who think that home-made jellies and jams generally speaking, are to be preferred to those made in factories.

Restricting the home on sugar is wonderful for the canning factory. When the housewife cannot can her own fruit, she is compelled to buy the factory's product at an inflated price, and because the housewife cannot can her own fruit, there is more fruit available for the commercial canneries at a deflated price. Moreover, regardless of price, the suburbanite or the farmer who produces small quantities of fruits for his own use is not equipped to pick and market that fruit. So it simply rots on the ground.

DEFENSE OF RATIONING

In defense of its rationing of sugar, Agriculture says that there is only so much sugar and that the industrial users have been cut as well as everyone else. What they do not say is that industrial users are now employing more sirups, as they are equipped to do, as a substitute for sugar. The production of corn sirup has doubled; that of cane refiners' sirup is up eight times over prewar production. These are not rationed. And most of this increased production is going to industrial and commercial users of sugar. Further, there is no scarcity—at least such

a scarcity as we have been asked to believe. In fact, the Cuban sugar crop this year is expected to be nearly a milion tons greater than last year.

The American housewives would be willing to adjust themselves to a scarcity in supply. The substance of their complaint is that the sugar-rationing program has been used to change the buying habits of the Nation to the profit of the industrial users of sugar. They maintain that they have been shortchanged on sugar so as to be compelled to buy manufactured products at high prices instead of using their home canning and baking facilities.

They feel that had it not been for the determined forcing of home canners into the market for manufactured products, the prices would have fallen long ago.

Our Government can do curious things at times. And so can our businessmen. They are all for a competitive market, they are for competition and individual initiative—or pretend to be—except when the competition and the individual initiative are real.

## Fruits and Vegetable Market News Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1947*

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, since 1915 the Fruit and Vegetable Market News Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has conducted a service for the benefit of growers and various trade groups concerned with the marketing of fruits and vegetables. At the present time this agency operates year-round offices in 22 of the larger terminal markets. In addition, throughout the course of a year approximately 40 seasonal field offices are operated during the active harvesting and marketing seasons in major producing areas. Through an interchange of information over the market news leased wire system these offices have kept growers, shippers, and other factors informed as to supplies, market conditions, and prices in important producing areas and in major terminal markets. This has made possible more effective distribution of the available supplies, so as to obtain the best returns. This system of daily reporting, with dissemination on a national basis, has also made it possible for growers and shippers to maintain a close check on returns being received.

An example of the seasonal field offices is the one which has been operated at Spartanburg, S. C., in my own district, for the past two summers during the peach season. Last year South Carolina topped all States in the shipment of fresh peaches, and Spartanburg County topped all counties in the Nation.

When South Carolina became a major peach-producing State producers and shippers realized they were at a disadvantage in not having complete market information available during the shipping season, so in response to urgent requests from growers and shippers in that area the Spartanburg office was opened in the summer of 1945. Last season the active mailing list of the Spartanburg office carried over 900 who received daily mailed reports. Most were South Carolina growers and shippers, although many reports were sent to distributors in terminal markets or producers in other nearby areas. The Spartanburg Herald and Spartanburg Journal and radio stations WSPA and WORD gave daily publicity to market reports furnished by the Spartanburg office. Through these various means of market news dissemination all interested parties were kept currently advised as to market conditions and prices in the South Carolina peach crop. I have been informed that the Department of Agriculture has received numerous favorable comments on the work done by this office at Spartanburg and I, myself, have received letters from the peach growers expressing their appreciation for the fine market news service furnished them by that office.

The cost to the Government of the Spartanburg office is slightly over $1,000 per season. The State of South Carolina, through the Clemson College extension service, cooperates to the extent of about $300. The Spartanburg office operates normally during a period of about 6 weeks. That office is of a type similar to about 80 percent of the seasonal offices and more than half of the terminal market offices, in that it is operated with one technical marketing specialist and one clerk. Because of the small personnel involved in the operation of such offices it is virtually impossible to reduce the cost of operation since the work cannot be handled by one individual. In view of this, any extensive reduction in funds could be absorbed only by the closing of certain offices, since the cost of operation has always been at a minimum level.

The important role played by the Spartanburg office is clearly indicated by the following statistics: Total rail shipments of peaches from South Carolina during the 1946 season were 9,396 carlots, as compared with 6,791 cars from Georgia and a United States total of 31,805 cars. In addition to rail movement, there was a fairly heavy truck movement from all the major peach-shipping areas. As compared with the 10-year average, the production of most States during the 1946 season was little changed. The one exception, however, was South Carolina, as this State's estimated production in 1946 was nearly three times as large as the 10-year average. No other State even doubled the production of the 10-year average period 1935–44. During the 1946 season South Carolina peaches were shipped to 33 States, the District of Columbia, Canada, and Cuba.

On the basis of statistics reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, South Carolina has another large peach crop in prospect for the forthcoming season. The April 10 crop report shows the condition of the South Carolina peach crop on April 1 at 85 percent of normal, which is three points higher than last year.

In view of the indispensable service of the Market News Division to the farmers and fruit growers and the consumers throughout the Nation, it is hoped that this agency may be continued at its present level of operation.

## Danger Signals for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1947*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at the time when we are considering the agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year it seems appropriate that we consider some basic factors underlying our agricultural economy which are disturbing because they can lead to serious trouble if ignored.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Chester D. Tripp, published in January 1947:

People are fairly complacent about the agricultural price situation. The well-being of the people is high, consumption is high, crops are bountiful, the world needs our food, and will for some time. In addition to this, a beneficent Government has guaranteed parity prices on 20 of our important crops. So why worry? Between an assured big demand, an assured adequate price, and an assured large consumption it would seem as though time might be put in to better advantage than trying to look for trouble. It is generally a thankless job to be a dike inspector when the water is low. The inhabitants are usually complacent about the condition of the dike under such circumstances. Experience tells us that a timely survey of some of the salient points in the dike that might develop points of weakness are often warranted.

A discussion of the agricultural situation, with this in mind, might be interesting. We have data covering a very long period of agricultural prices and, strange as it may seem, these data disclose devastating maladjustments in the agricultural price structure in the years following great wars. History accounts for these upsets in different ways. In the great upset after the Napoleonic War, the literature indicates that agricultural prices went to pieces because the expansion of world shipping opened up great new sources of supply. After the Civil War we experienced another upset, which the commentators of the day felt was due to the opening of the West, which brought in a superabundance of supplies. The record indicates that after a short waiting period agricultural prices were nearly cut in two after World War I. It seems more logical to simply say that all great wars interfere with production and distribution than to try to give some definite reason for the occurrence. War, as such, brings great numbers of people to the verge of starvation. As a result, prices and production are increased wherever possible. As the world returns to normalcy and production and distribution improve, the weight of competition weighs heavily on the artificial price structure created by the war. In each important war of which we have record the price of agricultural products increased enormously during the war and then fell precipitately a short time after the war.

We have lately finished another war, during which prices advanced enormously, thus completing the first lap of the cycle; in fact, ceilings, quotas, incentives in one form or another were tried, but to no avail. The price structure of agricultural products is higher today than it has ever been in the memory of man.

Under such conditions, it does not seem as though one was going far afield to look for trouble, or, to put it another way, to look for repetition of the standard pattern. One outstanding thing is the well-known fact that consumption of agricultural prod-

ucts is one of the most inflexible factors in all our economy. Well-being can be increased substantially without any great change in quantity of consumption. Abundant means increases the demand for quality goods, but the demand for calories is relatively inflexible. A ditch digger may acquire a million dollars but he does not change his food consumption in proportion by so doing. We are obviously dealing with a rigidity in consumption, and, for this reason, it is interesting to note what drastic price changes are necessary to cut production.

Production of agricultural items is surprisingly stable. There is the time lag of a crop year involved in most production. Many crops, such as fruits, are planned years in advance: They have to be marketed regardless of price at the time of their maturity. With this in mind, it is interesting to see what a drastic drop in prices took place in 1920 and what a relatively small effect this had on production.

Again, the decline in prices that started in 1929, went on for several years before average production was cut as much as 10 percent. We further note that at the present time, the volume of agricultural production is almost at its high point and the price range is at a new high.

The per capita domestic consumption is now at the high figure for all time, and agricultural exports for the year are very high. If either of these factors should decline, even slightly, on the record we face a set of facts that might lead to disturbing results. There is no reason to believe that the export demand will stay at this high point unless we are prepared to give food away. For economic reasons, we are getting more cautious in our giving and time is working against us, as around the world production is slowly being re-established. As far as the domestic situation is concerned, our population is consuming about 16 percent more food per capita than it ever did before, and it is not likely to increase that amount greatly.

To be sure we have another bulwark back of the price structure, and that is the parity arrangements with the Government. Prices are now on an average of 124 percent of parity, and, in theory, prices could drop to 90 percent of the parity figure without unduly reducing the purchasing power of the agricultural areas. Many of our requirements are priced well above parity but some prices are beginning to recede so that great quantities of material might be tendered to the Government under the guaranty. As an illustration, the enormous corn crop is just on a parity point and any further drop in the corn price might load the Government with an enormous amount of corn, because, under the law, the Government stands ready to pay parity to the grower for his product. Corn, on the other hand, is largely consumed in producing beef cattle and hogs. Both cattle and hog prices are well above parity. If, however, there should be a drop in these prices below parity, the principal market for corn would rest with the Government. We would then immediately be faced with storage problems, or arrangements for further donations, or long-term sales that might weigh heavily on balancing the budget.

The law covering agricultural parity only deals with twenty commodities out of some hundred that are recognized on the commodity list. Among these unrecognized commodities are a number of important crops that are very important in certain agricultural areas and to large groups of the population. Take, for example, the citrus fruit situation. Citrus fruits have no parity. Yet, their culture is of paramount interest in Florida, Texas, and California. It has enjoyed 3 years of excellent prices which have encouraged intensive cultivation and substantial new plantings. Now, as the result of good crops and the backing up of demand, we face a surplus of supply. The price dropped from $40 a ton to about $10 a ton. This new price is unrewarding to the grower. Grapefruit juice, based on this price, is literally as cheap as spring water. It is quite a question whether this drop in price will increase consumption as much as 10 percent. This break in price is slowly filtering through to retail channels. Juice canners find that their inventory has seriously backed up on their shelves. A number of plants are closed because they do not dare face the commercial risks involved in further manufacturing and, as a result, a demoralization is taking hold in these fruit raising territories which is beginning to show itself in the spending habits of these communities.

Another example of oversupply that has already come to the surface, is the potato situation. I have personally seen tens of thousands of bushels of graded and sacked potatoes going to waste in the fields because there is no place to store them nor a market to put them on. Yet, there certainly are many people in the big cities who are eating low-grade potatoes at prices fully up to the parity figure. Obviously, the Government is in an embarrassing position. If potatoes are offered at great discounts to consumers, the market of the whole industry would become demoralized. Literally, we are facing on economic waste that is reminiscent of the days in Brazil when coffee was used for firing boilers. Although weakness has broken out only in a few spots, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the situation has been bolstered by great exports and that domestic consumption is at the highest figure it has ever been. These factors are alarming in themselves. When taken into consideration in the long-time record, however, the pattern without exception, shows agricultural price demoralization after every great war. One is warranted in stopping and thinking before the trouble even starts.

I am not predicting a demoralization of agricultural prices. I am supplying some facts and figures which to my mind are thoroughly disturbing. Our price structure is out of line with the rest of the world on many items. The rest of the world's production is beginning to increase again, and I think we should be mentally prepared for something of an upset in our exports. The laws governing parity prices may help for a minute but if these parity prices are too high to limit production, they only develop further complications such as added donations, or congested storage, or actual destruction of food. Parts of the world have gone through a period of 5 years without having enough to eat. We are not going into a period where there is too much to eat, but we may be facing a period where there is more than we can eat and more than the other fellow can pay for.

Agriculture is not an industry unto itself. Its well-being has profound psychological effects, in that the problems this industry faces in regard to prices may easily be reflected in the affairs of other economic groups.

CHESTER D. TRIPP.

## The Late Reverend Edward T. Dunne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1947*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following inspiring eulogy in tribute to the exemplary piety of Rev. Father Edward T. Dunne, which was delivered by Rev. Father Cornelius Sherlock, diocesan superintendent of schools, Boston, at the funeral Mass at St. Patrick's Church, South Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, May 24, 1947:

"He that shall do and teach, he shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matthew 5: 19.

Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, Reverend Brothers and Sisters, relatives and friends of Father Dunne, the emotions that weigh upon our hearts this morning are many. Probably the most assertive is a feeling of loss that one so loved and so revered has left our earthly paths to walk the streets of another world. And so we do well to express our sympathy to one another and to pray that the pain of this breavement may not be too great for our all too human hearts to bear. To Father Dunne's mother, and to his brothers and sisters we promise our prayers that God may lighten the burden of their sorrow and console them by their excellence of his now completed priestly life. To the priests with whom he lived and worked we express our sorrow for the loss they have sustained. We, the companions of his student days, who prepared with him for the life in God's vineyard, tell to each other our mutual sadness that one whom we admired and loved has left us. To the sisters and the children we hesitate to put in words our feelings for their great loss. They had too great a share of his interest and devoted care. To his friends, the faithful of Saint Patrick's, and that other multitude who knew and loved him at other times and in other places we extend our condolence at the loss of their priestly friend.

But if the thoughts of sympathy and sorrow seem to be uppermost in our minds they are not the most important truths of which we should be conscious. The Church, still mindful of the sadness of deserted friends, would remind us that death is really the vestibule of heaven, that, after all, Catholics are always preparing for their last day on earth as a time when the cares and heartaches, the trials and disappointments of life are shuffled off. She would drive home to our minds the fact that death is a gateway through which those who have served God well move into an eternity of endless, or infinite happiness. The truth is that Father Dunne, deep and intense as his love for us really is, would not return from the joys of Heaven. He would rather tell us that time is at most a passing instant and that, if we will but follow the commandments and counsels of our Lord, we will join him in his happiness in God's own good time. Laughter and tears have a way of being strangely mixed in this uneven life of ours but for Catholics, even in such deep sadness as this, the fact of our eternal destiny transcends our sorrow and make today rich in the reality of a priest's ineffable reward as he enters into the heavenly home an all-loving Father has prepared for him.

Father Dunne was on the point of completing his nineteenth year as a priest in the archdiocese of Boston. Actually he and I had arranged to have dinner together tomorrow evening to observe the anniversary of our ordination to review a little the 19 years that have passed and to plan ahead for priestly work in the future. But such plans are always, at most, tentative. Quite clearly, man proposes, but God disposes.

Ordained on the 25th of May 1928, Father Dunne was assigned to the parish in Ayer for the summer. When autumn came he was transferred to Saint Paul's in Wellesley where his long and deep friendship with Monsignor Daly began. Eight years in Wellesley were followed by a shorter assignment to the parish of the Immaculate Conception in Newburyport. He then came here to Saint Patrick's to spend the last eight

years of his life working again with Monsignor Daly, but now for the people of South Lawrence.

If he had a characteristic which stood out above all others, it was his intense devotion to children. In his earlier priesthood in Wellesley there was no parish school but there two important groups of young people found in him a zealous friend and prudent guide. It was there that he developed with great success his work with Catholic Boy Scouts. I remember well the eagerness with which he outlined plans for his charges and the satisfaction he reflected with each succeeding achievement. This activity developed, in more recent years, into his extensive work for Scouting in this area. His interest and ability were widely recognized and, as you know, he served as commissioner for the Catholic Boy Scouts of Essex County.

He was concerned too, in those earlier years, with the problems of Catholic students in non-Catholic colleges and carried on, with great expenditure of time and energy a very successful program among the Catholic students at Wellesley College. From time to time in later years the evidence of the excellence of this work appeared in the letters he received from far places of the world, from former students to whom his guidance was still proving a compass in perplexity or an anchor in some stormy reach of life.

When he came here to South Lawrence the opportunity for which he seemed most fitted presented itself. Here was an excellent parish school. With the encouragement of his pastor and friend, he entered into school work with high purpose and unbounded energy. Despite the exactions of busy parish life he studiously prepared himself for school work. He became interested in every educational problem that appeared and left no stone unturned to help boys and girls in their quest for happiness. The Sisters came to know him as a generous, sound and realistic friend who worked tirelessly with them in every way that would assure success for the educational program. Their loss in him will not be easily forgotten.

Through all his activity there appeared a constantly reiterated philosophy that reduced itself to the irrefutable question, "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul." Teaching with him was to make children happy and in his scheme of things even temporal happiness and success must be so attained that it will lead his children inevitably to heaven.

I remember well a week we passed together in Maine in which much of our time was spent in studying some smaller forms of marine life in the great tide pools at the rocky edge of the sea. One day while we were wondering at the beautiful complexities and obvious purpose of some tiny organisms, he said, almost wistfully, "If we could only hold classes here on this magnificent coast, how much more effectively we could explain to children the power and wonder of God." That night he left for South Lawrence bringing back with him great water jars of sea life that his teachers, and later the children, might examine these marvelous creatures and understand more clearly some truths of science and envision more fully the power of God who created such wonders of the sea.

But he saw the growth of children in mind and soul as a problem much broader than the school and so it was that he took particular delight in his work with the Holy Family Sodality. "Children," he would say, "are so largely the products of their homes." He could say this with a natural logic for he himself illustrated in his life the wondrous influence of his own parents, parents whose teaching and example gave two priests to God and a daughter to His service. Through the mothers and future mothers of Lawrence he still worked valiantly for the welfare of children. The broader aspects of community life also claimed his attention. Non-Catholic and Catholic alike knew him as one concerned about community affairs. He worked willingly with any group that aimed at community improvement. The ultimate reason again was that his children would one day be adults in this community and his continuing love for children was a compelling force that made him work for an even better society in which they might live.

Father Dunne had no personal ambitions, no thirst for fame, no quest for honors. In fact, in regard to himself, he was singularly reticent. All he desired was the opportunity to work, to bring God to others in the mass and the sacraments, to teach, to teach others to use God's graces, to teach his boys and girls to be happy here and happy for eternity. He didn't seek, not even expect thanks for his work but like the exiled patriarch of Patmos sought "no greater grace than this, to see all his children walk in the way of truth."—3 John 1: 4.

We who are gathered here today cannot view this occasion as one of unalloyed sorrow. Ours is not a ceremony of farewell but rather one of brief separation from one whom we shall later join in unending heavenly joy. The sacrifice with which we mark his going is not an offering ending in death but rather a sacrifice that renews life, a life of the souls of men, a life that will never end. This moment is, in reality, a time of congratulation that one who served God well, beyond the usual measure of men, now faces our Lord to hear the ancient commendation: "Well done * * * enter into the joy of the Lord."

Father Dunne has been a doer of the word of God and a teacher of His truth. It is of such that the Lord said: "He that shall do and teach shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven."—Matthew 5: 19.

---

## Newsweek Presents Remarkable Survey—What Communists Are Up To: Intrigue and Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1947*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities I desire to call attention to an article from the June 2 issue of Newsweek magazine. This is indeed a remarkable and a noteworthy article. It is a comprehensive, carefully detailed analysis of Communist activities and influences in the United States. It names names, cites cases, and identifies the media relied upon by Red Fascists to spread the atheistic doctrine of communism. It should be read and thoughtfully studied by all Americans.

The article follows:

WHAT COMMUNISTS ARE UP TO: INTRIGUE AND INFILTRATION—ENEMY WITHIN THE GATES

In a Federal court in the Nation's Capital last week, a small wisp of a man named Carl Aldo Marbani stood with clenched hands and blanching face listening to the reading of the verdict on each of 11 charges against him. The charges intoned by the jury foreman, all involving concealment of Communist affiliations while in Government employ, were not new to the Italian-born Marbani; in the course of his 11-day trial he had heard them many times. But now the dread word "guilty" uttered after each and every one of them sent him white.

Small wonder that Marbani's conviction brought joy to the Department of Justice; although every high official in Washington has long known that Communist penetration into the Government has attained serious proportions, this trial was the first of its kind. To Attorney General Tom C. Clark, the door was wide open to press the administration's $25,000,000 program to eliminate Communists from the Federal pay roll.

How far? What not a few Americans asked was, If Marbani, a Communist Party member under the name of "Tony Whales," could insinuate himself into a wartime job in the highly secret Office of Strategic Services (he picked targets for the Doolittle raid on Tokyo) and could later enjoy a $7,175-a-year State Department position, how far had Communists been able to penetrate other phases of American life where surveillance of key figures could not begin to match the Government's screening of its employees?

To those students of the Communist conspiracy, like David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, "No organization in American life has been immune from Communist penetration. * * * Labor unions have been their special target * * * [but] obedient to centralized direction, Communists have bored within church bodies, educational institutions, women's clubs, scientific groups, and, believe it or not, businessmen's associations."

If most Americans, natively nonconspirational in the first place, found it difficult to believe that a small band of zealots, numbering not more than 70,000 party members and a half million or so fellow travelers, could wield the power of a potential "fifth column," it was not to be wondered at. Nevertheless, the evidence, if examined with reasonable patience, could not be denied.

1. FRONTS AND BACKERS

When the anti-Communist movement of the twenties was at its zenith, the party went underground. Today its tactic is different. Party members, blatant during the war, are making themselves inconspicuous, but are laboring more furiously than ever through fellow travelers and innocent liberals who have never grasped the fact that the Communist Party's policies and strategy are guided solely by Soviet interests.

Consequently, the Communists work through fronts—innocent-appearing outfits with idealistic-sounding names, organized for specific purposes. These groups often succeed in attracting many non-Communist liberals, and occasionally even stanch conservatives.

Often, the Communists move into already established liberal organizations and seize control. They did this with the American Labor Party in New York. The Communist-controlled ALP has been quite successful. It has elected one member to Congress, Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, and two New York City Councilmen, Michael Quill and Eugene Connolly, who work hand-in-glove with two councilmen elected on the Communist Party ticket, Benjamin Davis, Jr., and Robert Cacchione.

Change here for Moscow: The case of the Progressive Citizens of America is characteristic of the way Communists can infiltrate liberal organizations and make them soap boxes for Communist propaganda.

The Independent Voters Committee, later renamed the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and the National Citizens Political Action Committee, now merged in the PCA, started out in 1944 for one purpose—to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt. Although the Communist Party later openly boasted that it had done much to build up the Independent Citizens Committee, both the ICC and the NCPAC at

voters first to register and then to vote. It took a lot of the little time I had available for baseball and other cultural pursuits.

I pointed out that fact to my father, and his rejoinder always took the form of an essay on the duties of a citizen. I wound up working to preserve the Republic at the then bitter cost of never becoming a good first baseman. Jim Farley did better, both in politics and baseball.

By that experience of long ago I became aware of the hours which district and precinct workers put in on the sometimes unappreciated task of building and maintaining a political organization. That is why, in paying tribute to Mayor O'Dwyer, I also pay tribute to all those of you who have had the discipline and unselfish patriotism to maintain a continuing interest in party affairs.

For three quarters of a century the powers of government in the United States have been exercised by one of two great parties—the Republicans or the Democrats. Broadly speaking, that has proved to be a sound system, as, under different party labels, it has been in our sister democracies of Canada and Great Britain.

Governments deriving from more than two or three parties have proved incapable of providing strong and continuing federal systems. Thus, proportional representation, while attractive in theory, seems to be unsound in application. It is government by fractions, the beginning of government by veto, without responsibility. In Germany that system gave Hitler his opening.

My own inherited Democratic membership was cemented by my admiration for two of its greatest leaders—Woodrow Wilson and Alfred E. Smith, for whom I know Franklin Roosevelt had the same admiration and respect. Their names, with those of Jefferson, Monroe, Madison, Grover Cleveland and Newton Baker illustrate the diversity of appeal and the variety of thought which attracted men to this party.

The charge has sometimes been made that the Democratic Party embraces too many diverging and conflicting schools of economic and social thought. The conservatism of the South and the radicalism of the great cities of the North are said to make poor teammates—granted that we accept the unsubstantial evidence that all Southern Democrats are reactionary and all Northern urban Democrats are radicals—which I do not. Even if one accepts the existence of these differences of opinion, I hold the fact to be an asset and not a liability. The essence of democratic government is to provide every group in our system a fair chance for expression.

That is what I regard as the genius of President Truman's administration. By voice and deed he has demonstrated his deep belief in the right of every man to express his opinions. It is a distinguishing feature of his relations with his Cabinet and with the present majority party in the House and Senate. There is no political subtlety or smartness in the President's effort to cooperate with the Republican Congress. He knows that the problems of the world are too deep and too serious to be dealt with on the level of domestic partisan politics. When he bespeaks cooperation he means just that, and I know he has done his best to carry out his part of the pledge.

I want now to talk a little about business and the American economic system.

This great industrial, agricultural, and trading community which is the United States, was built under a social and economic philosophy which we may call democratic capitalism. It is a system dedicated to the idea that the welfare of the country is better secured through the exercise of individual initiative and effort than it could be by a State-owned economy administered through a vast and complex bureaucracy.

With that belief I hold deeply and strongly.

During the war I saw what a complicated job it is to operate the national economy with Federal controls. Some were necessary to achieve the cooperation required for total war. But their continuance in peacetime would wreck the country and in my judgment destroy its capabilities for service to the world. There is no one man or committee of men with sufficient knowledge, wisdom, and capacity to manage an economy as hugely productive as ours—an economy which poured out the weapons and men to achieve victory in the war and which since has poured out billions to help restore a deeply injured world society.

This economy of ours is a delicately balanced machine. Its driving force is incentive, not merely the incentive of profits or wages but the incentive of service. The production of goods in quantity is its mainspring and it is that quantity production which provides the real wages of labor.

Socialistic advocates in Britain have found that underproduction can and does produce unemployment; that high wages which cannot buy goods cease to provide the incentive to work just as businessmen find that high prices destroy markets.

Business and commerce are effective forces for peace and stability in the world. Businessmen are always on the side of peace because they need it to provide the conditions under which their ventures can be pursued with confidence. Businessmen are by nature radical optimists—if they were not, few could continue against the appalling obstacles that today hinder the free exercise of their energies throughout the world.

No governmental planning or supervision or control can take the place of business initiative in maintaining that high production of goods and services which made this Nation great and which the world will require from us for many years to come.

All nations and states in the world today are based upon capitalism, the difference being merely between state capitalism and individual capitalism. Our system finances productive enterprise from the savings of individuals, deposited in banks and insurance companies, rather than collected by Government levy. The savings of our people are channeled into new ventures and into the extension of existing enterprises through commercial and investment banking.

The alternative is for government to collect all the people's earnings above subsistence needs, to channel those savings as it wills and ultimately to own the instruments of production. Inevitably that means that government must ultimately own and control and direct labor.

I am in violent disagreement with every and any aspect of such a system.

But let us not forget that it can and does offer a hard and ruthless competition, for elsewhere it bids for the minds of men and women surviving in despair and poverty, in the ruins left by war, with promises of a future worldly paradise.

Such an appeal Hitler made to the unhappy German people. That he and his satellites perished with his mad dreams can be of little solace to the grey shadows of human beings who walk today in the rubble and ruin of Berlin.

I want to talk about another great stone in the foundation of American society. No group in our community has a greater share in meeting and overcoming the great difficulties of the postwar world than American labor. At the moment the tide of popular sentiment seems to be running somewhat against labor and particularly against the leaders of labor. I would like to recall to businessmen that a little over a decade ago the tide was running sharply against business and its leaders.

As a nation we are apt to make black-and-white assessment of blame when we are troubled. That is an understandable and human weakness but the temptation to put on labor all the blame for industrial difficulties and high prices is as unjust as it is to saddle all business with that blame.

I came to know a good many labor leaders during the war. I saw a good deal of labor itself and I can testify to the great participation of the American working man in victory. Most leaders of labor are neither Communists nor Socialists. Many of them realize the need of adjustments to rectify existing imbalances in labor laws. Bitterness against all labor and all labor leaders as a group is just as dangerous, just as unfair as the tendency 15 years ago to smear all business and all management. Indicting fellow Americans by groups is the negation of democracy, for ours is a classless society in fact, not by empty boast.

It would be inappropriate for me not to make some mention here of another great foundation stone of our Nation—the Armed Services. The Army and the Navy, the Marines and the Air Forces, during the war constituted the greatest fighting forces on earth. Now, let there be no misunderstanding, they are dedicated to keeping the peace. They exist not to impose the will of the United States upon other people but to guard us against attack, to defend the United States; in due course, to take their part in securing world peace through the policing functions of the United Nations, and, finally to make clear to the world that we do not again intend to succumb to the fallacy that you can secure peace by stripping yourself of the means and of the power to make war.

Let me utilize this reference to the Army and Navy to draw a rough parallel between them and our American society.

During the war we developed and used the greatest military combination of men and machines that history has known.

Army Ground Forces, trained at great speed, magnificently equipped, smashed their way across Africa and Europe in extraordinary military achievement.

The Air Forces of the Army, almost from a standing start, within 3 years achieved mastery of Germany's air power.

The United States Navy swept the seas of two hemispheres clear of the enemy, transported and supplied our forces overseas, and extinguished Japan as a naval power.

No one of these services could have done the job alone. It needed all three, working as a team, to win.

There is no room for group ego in the military services, and there is no place for it in our national society. Government cannot do the job alone. Invested capital cannot run factories without labor, nor can labor produce goods without that imponderable which has been so spectacularly developed in this country—the genius and skill of management.

We are all members of a common national team. We are all workers in the final analysis. We are all consumers. We are all investors, not merely in real estate and securities but in the future of America. Labor, without the partnership of private capital, must wind up as the corporate property of the state. Conversely, capital has a vital interest in a busy and prosperous America. There is no haven in which capital can be immune from depression.

The success of the American system is the greatest guarantor of its continuance. In addition to the exports of American credit and food and goods to a stricken world we must also send the spiritual message which is our real and greatest answer to the preachers of the doctrine of the economic and soulless man. I know of no better expression of such a faith than a quotation which I read last week from a hitherto unpublished essay of Woodrow Wilson:

"There is one thing I have a great enthusiasm about, I might almost say a reckless enthusiasm, and that is human liberty. The in-

dividual is indispensably the original, the first fact, of liberty. There is no such thing as corporate liberty. Liberty belongs to the individual or it does not exist."

That is the spiritual message which America, with God's help, must transmit not merely for its own preservation but for the salvation of the world. That is the faith of our community which we must export along with our capital, our foodstuffs, our machines, and our charity. It is the true essence of what we fought for in two wars. It is, I say again, personified in the career and service of Mayor O'Dwyer. It was because he came to a great free community that he had the opportunity to rise. It is because of his own deep devotion to liberty that he continues to serve the people.

## Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1948

SPEECH

OF

### HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1947*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, then the report on crop insurance is certainly one of the most inadequate reports ever submitted by any committee of the House, certainly by the Committee on Appropriations, on any bill reported in the last quarter of a century. It does not touch the real situation, top, side, or bottom. And it comprises one of the most essential services rendered by the Government today. Today no business operates without insurance. Notify any manufacturing plant or any modern business this afternoon that its insurance is canceled as of 12 o'clock tonight and that plant will not open for business tomorrow until its policies are renewed.

You yourself would not drive out on the highway in an automobile without insurance. Every business in the country operates under insurance policies which provide complete coverage and protection from every possible risk, including unavoidable disasters cataloged as "the providence of God"—every business except agriculture. And no business is so subject to the vicissitudes of the unpredictable providence of God. The farmer operates under incredible hazards of fire, frost, and flood, drought and deluge, pests, insects, disease, and predators, animal, vegetable, and human—operating in the field, the feed lot, and the warehouse.

Your banker will lend you money on any asset. If it burns or dies or is stolen, your insurance protects his loan. But he cannot lend on the farmer's crops—regardless of the amount invested in them or their potential value, because the farmer can get no insurance to protect the collateral.

In this way the farmer was denied one of the most essential of modern business services until in 1938 Congress authorized the Crop Insurance Corporation. It was a new field, without actuarial statistics and no blue prints on which to predicate a practical basis of operation. As a result, it lost money steadily. Its premiums and conditions of contract were inadequate to meet the losses and costs of operation. When this became apparent, the law was revised and rewritten, and since that time has been a success on every commodity on which insurance had been provided under the original law.

All of this is completely ignored in the report of the committee. No mention is made of the success of the service, since the readjustment, a most astonishing omission.

Instead of differentiating between operations under the old law and the new law, the report lumps all losses of the original immature system and reaches the wholly unjustified conclusion that no crop insurance can be provided for agriculture under any circumstances.

Likewise the report fails to call attention to the fact that no losses have been incurred under the new law on any of its operations except those on one single commodity, cotton, on which there had not been sufficient time and data to establish a practical basis. Incidentally, the defect on that one crop was that we sought to insure the co on producer a profit instead of insuring him against a loss. When we have had sufficient experience to develop a workable contract, the service to cotton can be made as practical and successful on that commodity as on the rest of the commodities on which the present law is showing an annual profit to the Government. For example, the Government made a profit on its insurance on wheat alone over the last 2 years aggregating something over $7,000,000, and it lost money on none of the several crops which it insured with the single exception of cotton, which was one of the crops recently brought under the provisions of the law without sufficient preliminary experience.

Now, because of the loss on that one commodity, the committee proposes to deny insurance to every other agricultural commodity. They propose to discontinue the service and institute an experimental service which is so inadequate and so poorly financed that it is evident that the real purpose is total liquidation and complete abandonment of all effort to provide for the farmer the service available to every other business.

The total of $1,000,000 recommended for administrative expenses in the report is a fraction of the amount needed for liquidation alone. The evidence is that some 450,000 crop insurance contracts are now in force with potential liabilities running into hundreds of millions of dollars. When the first law was rendered inactive in 1944, a total of $3,500,000 was provided for liquidation. Now only $1,000,000 is recommended for liquidation of a vastly larger establishment.

Under such circumstances the experimental crop insurance program which the committee suggests for 1948 could not even be started. There are no funds for liquidation much less for the initiation of a new program. The proposal of the committee is impractical to the point of absurdity. And the heartless abandonment of a successful program on all other commodities when only one is showing a loss, and on such an incomplete statement of the case, is to say the least difficult of justification.

I trust the bill reported by the legislative committee can be modified when it reaches the floor to provide for a continuance of insurance on those crops which have been self-sustaining and on an experimental basis on other crops with a view to establishing an actuarial basis on which such other crops can likewise be made self-sustaining as soon as experience justifies.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think in fairness the gentleman should recognize the fact that the Department of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and asked that this be continued only on an experimental basis, and that legislation has been passed to that effect.

Mr. CANNON. I am familiar to some extent with the figures that have been submitted. They show no recent losses on any crop except cotton.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That happened within the last week, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. But I ask my good friend who is an authority on agricultural problems, especially on those relating to dairying, if there is any reason why we should discontinue crop insurance on flax?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not in any position to answer that question.

Mr. CANNON. Can the gentleman suggest any reason at all why we should discontinue crop insurance on wheat?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would discontinue it the way it has been operating. They lost about $7,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. No, they have not. That is the difficulty here. We do not have the statistics. As a matter of fact the Government made a profit of $7,065,000 on wheat for the years 1945 and 1946.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. One hundred million dollars has disappeared somewhere, has it not?

Mr. CANNON. No money has been lost under the new law except on one commodity. Something like $20,000,000 was lost on that one crop but the Government has made money on everything else.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What commodity?

Mr. CANNON. The only loss this year has been on cotton and if that is being placed on an experimental basis, and eventually we will be able to service it as successfully and as profitably as the rest of the list.

But in the meantime what reason can the gentleman suggest for depriving all other agricultural products of the benefits of insurance?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to get the record straight. The legis-

lative committee that is in such good repute today has already passed legislation doing what the gentleman is criticizing—putting it on an experimental basis.

Mr. CANNON. No such law has been enacted. It has not even been brought up for consideration in the House. And until some further provision is made why not continue to function under the legislation now in force and under which insurance is being successfully provided for the great majority of American farmers?

I am certain my distinguished friend from Wisconsin joins with me in the belief that we should be fair and accurate and logical and helpful in the provision of a service which means so much to farmers and to all business associated with their success.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that when this vast program implemented by this bill was begun, American agriculture was at its lowest ebb. The farmer was bankrupt. His farmland was being sold by the sheriff. His banks were failing at the rate of hundreds a day. Farm tenancy had increased until ownership of small farms throughout the country was practically nil. Our soil was eroding at such a rate that hundreds of thousands of acres of American arable land were being removed permanently and forever from production. Business was stagnate throughout the country because the farmers had no buying power. In many sections mobs of farmers were threatening sheriffs with the hangman's noose when they came to dispossess families from the farm. You could not borrow a dime on any farm in my State. Men outraged by confiscatory prices stopped milk trucks on the highway and poured out the milk. They invaded courtrooms and took judges from the bench. There was chaos, demoralization, destitution, and desperation throughout the rural areas. Farmers put their remaining possessions in wagons and drifted through the country as okies, hopeless, homeless, and helpless.

That was the situation in which agriculture found itself when we began the programs implemented by the appropriations in this bill. Under these services the whole situation has been retrieved. We have brought the farmer back. He is enjoying today under these programs the greatest prosperity the American farmer has ever known. He is making a greater contribution to the Nation than has ever been made by agriculture in the history of the world. We are producing this year one and one-quarter billion bushels of wheat. We are producing the greatest corn crop in American history. We are feeding America and the world as it has never been fed before from American acres. And we have raised the farm buying power and the American standard of living in both the city and the country.

Now, they here propose to put the ax to the root of activities which have made the Nation great, rich, happy, and prosperous.

Mr. Chairman, I want to balance the budget. I have brought in bills which made rescissions greater than ever made by any bill reported before or since. I have stood on this floor and urged economy which the House denied. I am for economy. But I refuse to cut so deeply, my friends, as to wreck the machinery. And again I want to quote the New York Times, a wholly disinterested commentator:

> Some other items in the committee's report will bear further examination. No one can argue that there are no possible savings in the Department's budget. If Congress can hack away what is actually deadwood, it should do so.

Now, that is a reasonable position. That is the position that we have always taken.

> But this is no year in which to cut out or hamper any activity which will save or improve the fertility of our soil, reduce farm production, or impair the well-being of people on the land. Agriculture just now is a booming industry, but it can collapse at this critical period in history, as it has done before, if we apply penny-wise and short-sighted policies to it.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. A few minutes ago the gentleman was giving us a true historical picture of the plight of the farmer when we were not giving attention to him in matters of legislation. One man said about that time, "Destroy your cities and leave your farms and the cities will spring up again as if by magic. Destroy your farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in this country." Did that not come to pass?

Mr. CANNON. No greater truth has ever been spoken. The strength of America is in her farms and in her farm people. That is what is at stake in this bill.

---

## National Science Foundation Should Be Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 29, 1947*

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a National Science Foundation is of the utmost importance to the United States, and this Congress should pass legislation for the creation of this Foundation.

We are living in the scientific age, and must recognize the importance of scientific research and development. The war brought with it the discovery of atomic energy and American scientists developed the atomic bomb which stunned the world and enforced immediate peace.

Science opened the door to atomic warfare. What we have already seen of the destructive force of this new weapon is but the smallest part of its potential. Atomic energy coupled with the principle of the guided missile directed by television presents a demolition force so powerful that the destruction of an entire nation would not be improbable through its use. Atomic bombs small enough to be planted by saboteurs and detonated through the use of radio waves at the discretion of an enemy power are no longer mere fictional fantasy, but a possible danger which must be reckoned with for national safety.

There is only one answer to the problems which face us with the advent of atomic energy and atomic warfare. That answer is scientific research carried on by the best scientific minds this Nation can produce. Through such research we may find methods to counteract the destructive power of atomic energy and learn how to harness it for peacetime use for the benefit of all our people.

We need a National Science Foundation to coordinate the efforts of all the branches of science in research which will convert and confine atomic energy to peacetime utility. Atomic energy must be harnessed to produce power, and we cannot envision the extent to which this new force may revolutionize industry, transportation, and every phase of daily living. Our scientists can do the job, but they must have the tools with which to work, laboratory equipment, and men and women who are specialists in science to assist them and carry on the work of scientific research.

Before the last war, Europe had many centers of science, and the United States could draw upon these reservoirs of scientific knowledge for the development of new methods and new materials in medical research, biological science, and chemistry and physics. These European centers have been destroyed, and the United States must now develop its own scientific centers or be bypassed by the scientific development of other nations, such as the U. S. S. R. which has made available almost $1,000,000,000 for scientific research this year.

We must seek out the most promising material among our youth and provide scholarships so that boys and girls with special adaptability in the field of science can receive adequate training. Upon completion of their work, these young scientists can enter the field of research, and their accomplishments will benefit the Nation.

The future safety and prosperity of the United States may well depend upon the advancement of scientific research. We need a National Science Foundation, and I believe its establishment is of equal importance with any other issue before the Eightieth Congress The Senate has already approved S. 526, a bill which creates a National Science Foundation. I urge the Members of the House to pass this legislation, which will insure the maximum progress of scientific research and discovery in the United States.

## Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 29, 1947*

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an illuminating article in the New York Herald Tribune of May 28 by Walter Kerr on the Voice of America program:

WHY THE RUSSIANS TUNE IN—VOICE OF AMERICA PROVIDES ONLY FACTUAL PICTURE OF UNITED STATES

(By Walter Kerr)

Recent attempts in Congress to smother the State Department's Voice of America broadcasts to foreign lands are both alarming and astonishing to an American citizen returning to this country from the Soviet Union.

The explanation is simple. In the nightly programs beamed from the United States he found the only information available to Russians in their own language of American affairs as Americans see them. Opposing them were the carefully edited Soviet press and radio, painstakingly critical of American opinion and American action, presenting one over-all picture which may be summarized as follows:

That the United States is a fumbling, confused, grasping country that grew rich during the war and now hopes to enslave the world economically and politically—the whole controlled by a group of powerful industrialists, bankers, and politicians who prefer war to peace, social strife to social order and fascism to civil liberties.

The only contrary view that a Russian can hear comes from the Voice of America. Yet this voice came close to being silenced by congressional action a short time ago. The arguments against it claimed that it was unauthorized, mismanaged and a waste of money.

The first two objections apparently will be taken care of by a new bill which was approved last week by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and which, if it becomes law, will continue the broadcasts in the new fiscal year beginning July 1. The third—that it is a waste of money—is more difficult to answer, since there is no way of evaluating in terms of money the benefits of accurate information.

Americans in Moscow, however, contend that the programs are listened to by Russians, and their only suggestions consist of recommendations for improving the broadcasts.

As evidence of listener interest, besides individual Russians whom they know, they cite the recent attack on the Voice of America by Ilya Ehrenburg, the Soviet propagandist, whose skill with the pen most certainly would not have been employed if no one bothered to listen to what the Voice was saying. They also point to a recent cartoon in the magazine Krokadil, which pictured a department store display of short-wave receiving sets made in the shape of ducks. The duck sets were advertised as being useful for hearing the "quack, quack" broadcasts of the Voice of America.

Joseph Newman, the New York Herald Tribune correspondent in Moscow, reports that only a limited and spotty reaction has been noted since the programs were started last February. There is reason to believe, he says, that the broadcasts are heard mostly by higher-income groups, since they include men and women who can afford to buy short-wave sets. These sell for 1,500 rubles each, or more than the monthly income of a highly skilled and productive worker in a Moscow factory.

Among listeners he mentions doctors, lawyers, teachers, newspapermen, writers, actors, artists, dancers, scientists, army and naval officers, factory directors, engineers, and more important Government officials.

He says that the number of persons who hear the programs is not known by anyone and there is no basis for an intelligent guess. It is estimated, on the other hand, that there are about 1,000,000 sets in the Soviet Union, a majority of them built for short-wave reception.

He adds that without publicity of any kind Russians know the transmission time (9 p. m. to 10 p. m. daily) and frequencies (11,870 and 7,290 kilocycles). They have found out by playing with their own sets or by word of mouth.

The most serious criticism of the programs was poor reception, but this has been improved recently, although not sufficiently to put them on a par with broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corp. Soviet seven-tube sets, however, pick them up easily.

Of the material itself the most common complaint from Russians and Americans alike is that a 1-hour transmission is too long. It has been proposed to change over to three half-hour programs. It has been said that the treatment of scientific subjects is too technical for anyone except a scientist. One listener finds the jazz music too hot and another says he can hear all the classical music he wants over Soviet stations.

The top suggestion is that the programs be made even more factual than they are. Listeners apparently would prefer to hear discussions of problems confronting America rather than efforts to picture the United States as a paradise which they suspect it is not. Such suggestions are passed on to Americans in Moscow, who in turn report them to the State Department. They take a real interest in the Voice of America.

## Rice Leaders Rap Controls as Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 29, 1947*

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a newspaper article from the Lake Charles American Press, as follows:

RICE LEADERS RAP CONTROLS AS UNFAIR—DECLINE IN PRODUCTION, INCREASE IN MARKETS CITED AT CONVENTION

GALVESTON, TEX., May 24.—Rice dealers, brokers, and jobbers attending the Rice Millers Association convention here today said that possible continuation of controls on rice after the expiration date June 30 were unfair and unnecessary.

W. M. Reid, New Orleans, association executive vice president, said the 400 persons attending the convention were opposed to any extension of price controls.

"If controls continue, it will hurt the domestic rice market 100 percent," Reid said, "since 40 percent of the rice crop will be shipped out of the United States. The part of the rice crop allowed to remain in this country, under present regulations, will remain under fixed prices.

"It is unfavorable to the industry for controls to remain," Reid declared, "because there is no reason for one product to be under Government regulations when it is unnecessary."

PRODUCTION DROPS

Rice declined in production 25 percent in 1946 while markets for foods showed an increase of 43 percent in production over the prewar level, Reid said.

Unless price controls are lifted and rice is allowed to be sold on the domestic market, the consumer will be weaned away from the use of rice by its prohibitive costs and limited production, he said.

George Smith, Dewitt, Ark., vice president, said growers believed continued governmental controls would cripple their business.

Watson Rogers, Washington, D. C., president of the National Food Brokers Association, told the convention that members of the rice industry must strengthen their sales and merchandising programs if rice is to recapture its place in the American diet.

BUYING POWER

Fred J. Rossiter, of the United States Department of Agriculture, said in an address that he is concerned over the world's buying power.

"Before we become too optimistic about the heavy demand for rice," he said, "we must weigh the world's buying capacity."

He said several food experts have pointed out that the need for rice today is much greater than that of the prewar demand.

"Authorities estimate," he continued, "that the rice-eating population has increased from 5 to 10 percent during the past 10 years. This indicates that the need for rice will be far above the available supply."

## Organized Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 29, 1947*

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a news article by Mr. Constantine Brown, wherein he points out that there is anything but order in Europe today. It should be of interest to all Members of the House.

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN EUROPE CALLED ORGANIZED CHAOS

(By Constantine Brown)

Herbert Hoover, who because of his realistic and nonpartisan approach to world affairs ranks as America's elder statesman, informed the House Appropriations Committee that our present policies in Germany and Japan are forcing the American taxpayer to carry the burden of those countries' reparations.

Those who have kept abreast of developments in Europe and Asia concur with Mr. Hoover's conclusions, which are based on long study of conditions and several investigations undertaken at the request of President Truman. The Chief Executive himself is reported to share most of Mr. Hoover's contentions.

The economic and political situation in Europe can be described as the most perfectly organized condition of chaos the world has ever known. There are several points of economic vacuum in Europe, as well as in Asia, and American resources are being sucked into them in such quantities that if the flow continues, they will be drained off in the foreseeable future.

RUSSIAN POLICY BLAMED

We cannot afford to let the world starve. This is an American axiom which no political

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

1 TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For personal services in the office of the Secretary of
5 Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary,
6 in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other neces-
7 sary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to
8 exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses,
9 including examination of estimates for appropriations in the
10 field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight,
11 express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication
12 service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and
13 other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise pro-
14 vided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of
15 the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred
16 to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such
17 amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are
18 provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal
19 year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or
20 portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not
21 exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and
22 made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That
23 if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations
24 for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall
25 below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the

1 Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be trans-
2 ferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or
3 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
5 the Department shall determine are appropriate to the re-
6 quirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such
7 appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That, of
8 appropriations herein made which are available for the pur-
9 chase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each
10 option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land:
11 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
12 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or
13 employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee,
14 or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission,
15 or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any predic-
16 tion, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threat-
17 ened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future
18 prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further,*
19 That, except to provide materials required in or incident to
20 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
21 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this
22 Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured
23 from commodities or materials produced outside of the United
24 States.

1 PENALTY MAIL

2 For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of
3 the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944
4 (39 U. S. C. 321d), $3,186,000.

5 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

6 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including
8 in addition to the objects for which funds are available for
9 such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bank-
10 head-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration,
12 planning, and coordination of research under section 10
13 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary
14 expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the
15 Act, as follows:

16 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
17 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9
18 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
19 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $3,000,000, of
20 which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be
21 transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research
22 on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching
23 requirement;

24 For research on utilization and associated problems
25 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, $2,500,000;

1 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
2 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
3 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act, $1,500,000;

4 For the improvement and development, independently or
5 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
6 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
7 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
8 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
9 14, 1946), $2,000,000;

10 In all, $9,000,000: *Provided*, That such sums as may
11 be necessary for penalty mail as required by the Act of June
12 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular departmental
13 appropriation therefor: *Provided further*, That for necessary
14 printing and binding there may be transferred to, and made
15 a part of, the item "Printing and binding, Department of
16 Agriculture," such sums as are necessary: *Provided further*,
17 That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office,
18 or agency of the Department such amounts from this appro-
19 priation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for
20 which it is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition
21 to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other
22 appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*,
23 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work
24 relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

1 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

2 For necessary expenses, including personal services
3 in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues
4 for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service,
5 $2,025,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
6 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
7 in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses,
8 which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be deter-
9 mined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000
10 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation;
11 and there may be expended for personal services in the
12 District of Columbia not to exceed $1,597,000: *Provided,*
13 *however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations
14 or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any
15 time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respec-
16 tively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts
17 transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appro-
18 priation and the amount which may be expended for per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased
20 or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
21 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
22 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
23 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases
24 in such appropriations or authorizations.

1 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
4 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
5 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
6 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
7 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
8 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
9 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
10 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
11 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
12 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
13 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
14 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
15 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
16 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
17 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
18 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
19 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
20 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
21 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-
22 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
23 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
24 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be

1 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
2 which may be expended for personal services in the District
3 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
4 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
5 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
6 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
7 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
8 tions: *Provided further*, That when and to the extent that
9 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
10 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
11 of the various agencies of the Department can be more ad-
12 vantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
13 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
14 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
15 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
16 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
17 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
18 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That in
19 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
20 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
21 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
22 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944
23 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
24 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
25 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*

1 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
2 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
3 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
4 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
5 Francisco radio office.

6 PRINTING AND BINDING

7 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
8 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
9 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
10 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
11 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
12 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
13 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
14 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
15 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
16 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
17 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
18 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
19 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent
20 out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators,
21 Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall
22 direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants
23 of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on
24 Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919

1 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
2 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
3 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
4 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
5 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
6 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
7 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
8 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
9 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
10 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
11 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
12 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
13 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
14 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
15 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
16 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
17 for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
18 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such
19 sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in con-
20 nection therewith: *Provided further,* That the total amount
21 that may be transferred under the authority granted in the
22 preceding proviso shall not exceed $95,300.

23 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

24 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
25 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,

1 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
2 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
3 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
4 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
5 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
6 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
7 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

9 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
10 $1,887,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
11 including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per
12 annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books
13 of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

14 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
15 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
16 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
17 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation
18 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
19 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
20 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
21 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
22 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
23 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
24 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
25 their variations and trends, $1,743,600: *Provided,* That no

1 part of the funds herein appropriated or made available
2 to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading
3 "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county
4 land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for
5 the maintenance of regional offices.

6 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
7 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
8 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
9 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
10 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
11 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
12 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
13 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
14 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
15 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
16 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided,*
17 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-
18 able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or
19 publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
20 acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
21 production for other than the commercial crop.

22 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
23 RELATIONS

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the
25 Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling

1 the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the
2 Department in connection with foreign agricultural work,
3 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
4 not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $428,000.

5 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
6 COMMITTEES

7 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
8 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
9 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
10 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
11 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
12 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
13 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
14 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
15 thereto.

16 EXTENSION SERVICE

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO
18 RICO

19 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
20 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
21 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
22 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
23 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
24 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7

1 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
2 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
3 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
4 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
5 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
6 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
7 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
8 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
9 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
10 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
11 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
12 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
13 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
14 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
15 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 Administration and coordination of extension work:
18 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
19 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–
20 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
21 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
22 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
23 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
24 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

1 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

2 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
4 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
5 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
7 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
8 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
9 to the Department, from Government surplus without
10 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
11 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
12 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
13 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
14 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
15 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*
16 That the appropriation current at the time services are
17 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
18 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
19 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
20 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
21 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
22 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
23 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
24 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center

1 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
2 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
3 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
4 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
5 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
6 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
7 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
8 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
9 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
10 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
11 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
12 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
13 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
14 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
15 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
16 tor, whichever is greater.

17 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
18 AGRICULTURE

19 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
20 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
21 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
22 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
23 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
24 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by

1 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
2 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
3 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
4 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
5 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
6 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
7 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

8 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
9 MATERIALS

10 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
11 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
12 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
13 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
14 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
15 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
16 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of
17 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
18 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
19 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
20 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
21 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
22 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
23 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
24 $865,000.

1 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

2 To enable the Secretary, through such officers and
3 employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-
4 tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain
5 a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and
6 problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including
7 printing and binding, the employment of personal services
8 in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-
9 tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to
10 restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program
11 the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have
12 heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the
13 Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station
14 of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United
15 States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and
16 with other public and private agencies. The provisions of
17 this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of
18 the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take
19 such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine
20 to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-
21 under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use
22 of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds
23 of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including
24 its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than
25 any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-

1 poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable
2 continue the employment of the existing personnel of the
3 station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-
4 cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby
5 transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-
6 ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for
7 credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the
8 legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-
9 struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-
10 tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be
11 unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall
12 be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-
13 tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the
14 transfer.

15 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

16 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

17 For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico
18 to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the
19 provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
20 experiment stations:

21 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
22 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
23 C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
24 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
25 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of

1 the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the
2 lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department
3 in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

4 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
5 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
6 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
7 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

8 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
11 $1,059,000 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
12 trict of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions of the Act,
13 as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and
14 related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the live-
15 stock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-
16 bearing animals, as follows:

17 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
18 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
19 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
20 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
21 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
22 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
23 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

24 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of

1 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
2 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.
3 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
4 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
5 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
6 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
7 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
8 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-
9 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
10 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
11 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
12 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
13 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
14 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
15 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
16 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That
17 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
18 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
19 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
20 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
21 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
22 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
23 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
24 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
25 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

1 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
2 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
3 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
4 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
5 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
6 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
7 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance
8 with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and
9 the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the in-
10 spection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
11 $1,225,197.

12 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
13 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products,
14 $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States
15 as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to
16 be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall
17 be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an ade-
18 quate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every
19 person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished
20 inspection or service under said laws, including inspection
21 of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export
22 and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products,
23 shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with
24 regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and
25 at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be

1 deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full
2 reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the
3 furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific
4 and technical investigations and laboratory services; investi-
5 gations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions
6 under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; super-
7 visory, administrative, statistical, business management, and
8 other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia
9 and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal
10 Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District
11 of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger
12 motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase
13 of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized
14 by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431);
15 and other necessary expenses: *Provided,* That the Secretary
16 of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of
17 bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the
18 interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-
19 draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges
20 or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-
21 ment: *Provided further,* That inspection or other technical
22 services may be rendered to Government and other public
23 agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein
24 provided: *Provided further,* That a schedule of obligations
25 and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the

1 close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for
2 the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the
3 Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*
4 *further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service
5 rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

6 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
7 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
8 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
9 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
10 factured in the United States and the importation of such
11 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
12 animals, $290,000.

13 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
14 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
15 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
16 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
17 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
18 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
19 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
20 services in the District of Columbia.

21 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
22 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

23 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-

1 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
2 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
3 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
4 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
5 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
6 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
7 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
8 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar
9 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
10 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
11 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
12 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
13 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
14 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
15 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
16 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
17 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
18 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
19 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
20 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
21 United States Government for any such animals shall not
22 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
23 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
24 appraisal is the same for each bird.

1 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

2 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
3 not to exceed $500,000 for personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act of
5 May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404), including investiga-
6 tions, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry,
7 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May
8 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or
9 renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946
10 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S.
11 C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process
12 or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

13 For repair of buildings, fence, electric line and feed
14 bunk, recently damaged by tornado at the dairy field station,
15 Woodward, Oklahoma, $5,300.

16 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
17 ENGINEERING

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
20 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
21 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
22 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
23 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
24 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and

1 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
2 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
3 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
4 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
5 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
6 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
7 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
8 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
9 as follows:

10 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-
11 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn,
12 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
13 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
14 field crops, $2,784,000.

15 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
16 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
17 table, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
18 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
19 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
20 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
21 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
22 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
23 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
24 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
25 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dade

1 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
2 mately $7,000.

3 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
4 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
5 control, $359,280.

6 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
7 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
8 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
9 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
10 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural
11 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
12 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
13 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
14 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
15 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
16 cropping and improved soil management; $1,391,000.

17 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
18 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
19 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
20 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
21 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
22 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
23 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
24 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
25 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

1 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
2 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
3 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
4 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
5 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
6 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
7 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
8 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of
9 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act
10 of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

11 Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement
12 and repair of buildings, equipment and supplies, utilities,
13 fences and other general repairs and clean-up operations
14 from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward,
15 Oklahoma, $45,600.

16 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
19 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
20 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means
21 of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agri-
22 culture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
23 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
24 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
25 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best

1 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the
2 provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
3 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7
4 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
5 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and
6 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the
7 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
8 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-
9 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
10 and not to exceed $692,000 for personal services in the
11 District of Columbia, as follows:

12 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
13 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
14 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
15 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
16 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
17 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
18 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
19 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
20 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
21 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
22 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
23 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
24 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
25 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for

1 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
2 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
3 tion, $2,961,300.

4 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
5 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
6 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
7 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,
8 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal
9 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
10 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
11 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
12 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
13 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
14 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
15 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
16 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
17 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
18 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
19 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
20 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
21 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $2,697,100: *Provided,* That
22 no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or
23 value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property
24 injured or destroyed: *Provided further,* That, in the discre-
25 tion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be

1 expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State
2 until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accom-
3 plish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or
4 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
5 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or
6 local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the
7 accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided further*, That in the
8 discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appro-
9 priation shall be made for applying methods of control of the
10 Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the re-
11 moval and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering
12 from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such
13 removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate
14 for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or
15 sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been ap-
16 propriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or
17 local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations con-
18 cerned: *Provided, however*, That expenditures incurred for
19 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
20 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
21 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*,
22 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
23 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
24 disease except where such trees are located on property

1 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
2 or on property included within local experimental control
3 areas.

4 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
5 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
6 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
7 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
8 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7
9 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
10 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
11 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
12 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
13 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
14 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
16 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
17 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
18 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
19 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

20 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
21 PLANT DISEASES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
23 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
24 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
25 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys

1 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
2 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
3 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

4 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
7 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to
8 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
9 Columbia, as follows:

10 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
11 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
12 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
13 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
14 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
15 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
16 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
17 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
18 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
19 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
20 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
21 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
22 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
23 investigations; $511,500, and there shall be transferred to
24 the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from
25 Government surplus without compensation therefor, a cer-

1 tain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (con-
2 sisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser Subdivision,
3 and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728 in the city of Pasadena,
4 California), valued at approximately $15,800.

5 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
6 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
7 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
8 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
9 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
10 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.

11 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re
12 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)
13 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
14 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
15 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
16 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
17 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
18 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

19 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

20 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
21 ing not to exceed $381,700 for personal services in the
22 District of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the rela-
23 tive utility and economy of agricultural products for food,
24 clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions

1 of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of
2 such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
3 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
4 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
5 and for disseminating useful information on this subject,
6 $1,045,000.

7 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
9 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
10 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
11 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
12 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
13 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of
14 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
15 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
16 States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service
17 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
18 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
19 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
20 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
21 method development, and for operations conducted under
22 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to,
23 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
24 State and privately owned lands.

1 FOREST SERVICE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
4 $1,055,378 for personal services in the District of Colum-
5 bia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to
6 the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act
7 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the
8 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-
9 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
10 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
11 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
12 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for any experiment or test made outside
14 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of
15 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
16 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
17 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
18 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
19 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
20 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
21 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
22 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
23 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
24 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
25 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any

1 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
2 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
3 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
4 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
5 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
6 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
7 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil
8 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
9 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
10 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
11 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
12 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
13 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
14 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National
15 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
16 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
17 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
18 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
19 posters and related printed material, as follows:

20 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
21 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
22 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
23 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
24 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

25 National forest protection and management: For the

1 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
2 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
3 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
4 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
5 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
6 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
7 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to
8 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
9 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
10 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
11 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
12 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
13 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
14 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-
15 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
16 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
17 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
18 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
19 timber cultural operations; development and application
20 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
21 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
22 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
23 appraising of timber and other resources and development
24 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,

1 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
2 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
3 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
4 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
5 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
6 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
7 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
8 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or
9 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
10 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
11 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
12 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
13 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
14 $23,764,891, of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be
15 available for the purchase of one nursery site.

16 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
17 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
18 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
19 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
20 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
21 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

22 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
23 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
24 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,

1 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
2 nance of improvements, as follows:

3 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
4 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
5 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
6 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
7 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
8 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
9 $2,475,000.

10 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
11 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
12 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,000,000, of which at least
13 $11,050 shall be expended for research in the utilization of
14 waste woods.

15 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
16 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
17 under section 10, $572,000.

18 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

19 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
20 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
21 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
22 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
23 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
24 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
25 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

1 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

2 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
3 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
4 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
5 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
6 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
7 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
8 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
9 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and
10 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
11 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
12 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
13 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
14 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766)
15 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),
16 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
17 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
18 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
19 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
20 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
21 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
22 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
23 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
24 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

2 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
3 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
4 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $500,000, to be
5 available only for payment toward the purchase price of any
6 lands acquired.

7 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
8 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-
9 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
10 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
11 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
12 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
13 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
14 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
15 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
16 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;
17 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
18 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
19 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
20 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
21 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
22 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
23 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
24 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National

1 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
2 $35,000; in all $142,000.

3 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

4 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
5 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
6 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
7 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
8 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
9 Service administration, (1) $10,000,000 for forest develop-
10 ment roads and trails, and (2) $5,300,000 for forest high-
11 ways, which sums are authorized to be appropriated by
12 the Act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all,
13 $15,300,000 (including not to exceed $100,000 for per-
14 sonal services in the District of Columbia), to be imme-
15 diately available and to remain available until expended:
16 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
17 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
18 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and
19 supplies used for road and trail construction and main-
20 tenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased,
21 altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not
22 exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building
23 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
24 $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year

1 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of
2 such building as certified by the Secretary.

3 FLOOD CONTROL

4 Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance
5 with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as
6 amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examina-
7 tions and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
8 $500,000, including personal services in the District of
9 Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain avail-
10 able until expended, with which shall be merged the un-
11 expended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or trans-
12 ferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided,*
13 That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of
14 lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds with-
15 out specific approval of the county board of supervisors of
16 the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided*
17 *further,* That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947
18 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds
19 shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Depart-
20 ment's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations
21 Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be
22 necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available
23 prior year balances.

1 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

2 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
3 the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),
4 which provides for a national program of erosion control and
5 soil and water conservation, including not to exceed
6 $838,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
7 furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and main-
8 tenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or altera-
9 tion of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any
10 building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the
11 cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and
12 connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed
13 $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction
14 with land being purchased for other purposes and except for
15 eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed
16 $15,000 per building: *Provided further,* That no money
17 appropriated in this Act shall be available for the construc-
18 tion of any such building on land not owned by the Govern-
19 ment: *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where
20 the State has established a central State agency authorized
21 to enter into agreements with the United States or any of
22 its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
23 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
24 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
25 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation

1 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
2 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
3 as follows:

4 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
5 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
6 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and
7 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
8 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
9 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
10 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all
11 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
12 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
13 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for con-
14 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental water-
15 sheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $673,000.

16 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
17 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
18 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
19 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
20 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation
21 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
22 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
23 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
24 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
25 in demonstration projects.

1 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
2 SUBMARGINAL LAND

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
4 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
5 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions
6 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
7 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
8 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

9 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
10 ADMINISTRATION

11 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
12 RESOURCES

13 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
14 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive,
15 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-
16 proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–
17 590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment
18 Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except
19 the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and
20 the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-
21 ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for
22 the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-
23 plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the
24 United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until De-
25 cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said

1 provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as
2 amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,
3 during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,
4 inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000,000 of
5 the total sum provided under this head shall be available
6 during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-
7 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but
8 not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the ap-
9 propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,
10 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*
11 That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the
12 certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such
13 form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out
14 the conservation practice or practices and has complied with
15 all other requirements as conditions for such payments and
16 that the statements and information contained in the applica-
17 tion for payment are correct and true, to the best of his
18 knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March
19 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further,*
20 That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available
21 for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment
22 Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of
23 February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or
24 expenses of any regional information employees or any
25 State or county information employees, but this shall not

1 preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-
2 tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds
3 shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses
4 in connection with the formulation or administration of any
5 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-
6 conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,
7 as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment
8 Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-
9 ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the
10 Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer
11 to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-
12 sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing
13 payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such
14 amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-
15 lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any
16 soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-
17 cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming
18 practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program
19 under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*
20 *further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make
21 payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-
22 ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated
23 pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-
24 tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-
25 tary determines that, because of induction into the armed

1 forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were
2 prevented from filing, applications for payment under any
3 such program during the period the applicable appropri-
4 ation for such program was available for obligation,
5 such payments to be made out of the unobligated
6 balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use
7 of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of
8 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*
9 That an application for payment on the prescribed form is
10 filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in
11 case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer
12 under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the
13 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7
14 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the
15 date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December
16 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That
17 no part of any funds available to the Department, or
18 any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting
19 a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal
20 year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any
21 person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled
22 "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved
23 August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in
24 accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of
25 July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or

1 attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of
2 Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services
3 or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a
4 Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or
5 appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-
6 ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*
7 *further,* That where farmer participation in the program
8 in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full
9 amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or
10 sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to
11 States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have
12 not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

13 SUGAR ACT

14 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
15 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
16 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
17 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of
18 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
19 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)
20 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
21 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

22 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

23 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions
24 of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public
25 Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this

1 appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources
2 within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

3 ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING
4 AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
6 administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
7 Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including
8 personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

9 MARKETING SERVICES

10 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $2,-
11 211,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in
12 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
13 as follows:

14 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
15 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
16 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
17 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
18 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
19 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their
20 products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other
21 agricultural products, $1,527,500.

22 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
23 tions and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
24 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
25 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,

1 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
2 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when
3 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
4 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
5 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
6 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
7 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
8 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
9 service rendered, $712,000.

10 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
11 among the people of the United States useful information
12 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
13 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
14 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
15 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
16 ards of classification of American farm and food products
17 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as
18 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
19 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
20 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
21 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
22 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
23 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
24 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
25 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and

1 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
2 diem of persons serving without compensation while away
3 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
4 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
5 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make avail-
6 able to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department
7 such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary
8 to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is
9 made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts
10 transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation
11 items in this Act.

12 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
13 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
14 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
15 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
16 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection
17 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
18 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
19 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
20 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
21 $1,552,000.

22 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
23 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
24 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
25 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–

1 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
2 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.
3 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
4 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
5 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
6 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
7 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

8 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
9 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
10 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
11 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
12 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
13 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
14 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
15 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-
16 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
17 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

18 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
19 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
20 $1,128,000.

21 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
22 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

23 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
24 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
25 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation

1 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
2 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved
3 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
4 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
5 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
6 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
7 Congress.

8 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
9 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
10 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
11 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

12 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
13 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
14 91–99), $41,000.

15 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
16 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
17 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-
18 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
19 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
20 therein, $293,500.

21 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
22 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
23 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
24 $138,000.

1 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

2 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
3 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity
4 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
5 not to exceed $141,000 for personal services in the District
6 of Columbia, $530,000.

7 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

8 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
9 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
10 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
11 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
12 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
13 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
14 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

15 Loans: For loans under title II, $60,000,000.

16 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the
17 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
18 $1,000,000.

19 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
20 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
21 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
22 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
23 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
24 $18,000,000.

1 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
2 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
3 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-
4 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
5 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
6 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
7 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
8 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
9 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
10 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
11 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
12 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
13 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
14 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-
15 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
16 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security
17 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
18 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
19 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
20 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
21 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
22 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
23 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
24 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary

1 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
2 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
3 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
4 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of
5 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
6 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
7 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
8 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
9 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
10 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
11 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
12 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
13 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
14 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
15 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

16 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
17 AREAS

18 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
19 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
20 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
21 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
22 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
23 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
24 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

1 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

2 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
3 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
4 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

5 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-
6 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
7 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
8 financial and credit reports, $4,000,000.

9 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
10 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
11 7 thereof, $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary
12 of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section
13 3 (a) of said Act.

14 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act
15 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
16 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

17 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
18 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
19 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
20 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
21 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
22 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
23 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
24 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
25 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may

1 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
2 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
3 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
4 Electrification Administration established by Executive
5 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid
6 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
7 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
8 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
9 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
10 foregoing provision: *Provided,* That such obligations in-
11 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
12 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
13 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
14 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity
15 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
16 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of
17 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
18 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
19 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
20 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
21 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
22 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
23 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
24 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
25 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the

1 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
2 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
3 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
4 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
5 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
6 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
7 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
8 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
9 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
10 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
11 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
12 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
13 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
14 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions
15 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
16 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-
17 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
18 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
19 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
20 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
21 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
22 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
23 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
24 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is

1 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
2 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
3 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
4 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
5 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
6 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For
7 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
8 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
9 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
10 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
11 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
12 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
13 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
14 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
15 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.
16 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
17 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall
18 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
19 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
20 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
21 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
22 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
23 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

1 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses including personal services in
4 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
5 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
6 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
7 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
8 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-
9 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
10 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
11 lower price than to others, payment for which may
12 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
13 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
14 U. S. C. 833) ; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
15 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
16 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
17 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per
18 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
19 from their homes, without other compensation from the
20 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
21 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
22 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
23 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
24 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
25 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act

1 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
2 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
3 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
4 organizations as provided in said section.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
7 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
8 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,
9 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
10 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
11 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
12 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
13 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
14 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
15 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
16 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
17 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary
18 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
19 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-
20 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
21 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
22 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
23 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
24 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
25 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal

1 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
2 association serving the area.

3 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
4 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
5 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
6 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
7 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
8 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-
9 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
10 Department for which appropriations are made under such
11 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
12 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
13 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
14 Budget.

15 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
16 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
17 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
18 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
19 gency of persons in the field service of the Department
20 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
21 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
22 tural Relations.

23 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
24 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
25 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

1 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
2 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
3 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
4 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
5 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
6 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

7 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
8 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
9 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
10 the United States or who is a member of an organization
11 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
12 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
13 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
14 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
15 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
16 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
17 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
18 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
19 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
20 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
21 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
22 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
23 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
24 Government of the United States by force or violence:
25 *Provided further,* That such administrative or supervisory

1 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
2 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
3 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
4 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
5 *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a
6 strike against the Government of the United States or who
7 is a member of an organization of Government employees
8 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of
9 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
10 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
11 Government of the United States by force or violence
12 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
13 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
14 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
15 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
16 more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the
17 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
18 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
19 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be con-
20 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
21 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
22 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
23 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
24 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered

1 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
2 templated by this section.

3 SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Department of
4 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

5 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

6 SEC. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
7 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
8 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
9 year, namely:

10 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
11 expenses, $1,000,000, including not to exceed $700 for
12 newspapers.

13 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
14 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
15 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop
16 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
17 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
18 $10,000,000.

19 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
20 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
21 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
22 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
23 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
24 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation

1 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
2 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
3 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:
4 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
5 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
6 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
7 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
8 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
9 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
10 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for
11 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
12 (including legal and special services performed on a contract
13 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
14 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
15 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property
16 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
17 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
18 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
19 hereof.
20 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
21 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
22 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
23 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
24 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of

1 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
2 cotton, and flax.

3 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
4 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-
5 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
6 plicable to title II of this Act.

7 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

8 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF
9 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

10 Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Pub-
11 lic Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved
12 August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition
13 612 (c)), not more than $40,000,000 shall be available
14 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, for use in
15 effectuating the purposes of that Act. The remainder of
16 the fund appropriated by said Act for the fiscal year 1948
17 is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be
18 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury
19 immediately thereafter.

Passed the House of Representatives May 28, 1947.

Attest: JOHN ANDREWS,
*Clerk.*

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 14, 1947
For actions of July 11 & 12, 1947
80th-1st, Nos. 132 & 133

CONTENTS

Accounting.....48
Adjournment.....25,36
Agricultural Appropriation bill (individual items not indexed..... 1
Appropriations..2,15,16,17, 20,32,34
Banking and currency.....30
Consumer credit..... 9
Dairy industry.....12
Economic advisers..... 2
Electrification, rural...33
Extension work.....18
Farm program.....27
Fats and oils..... 5
Flood control.....11,32
Foreign affairs.....34
Health.....44
Housing.....28
Labor, farm.....37
Lands.....47
Lands, grazing.....23
Lands, reclamation.22,29,42
Latin America.....31
Legislative program...25,26
Loans, farm.....21
Patents..... 7
Peanuts.....40
Personnel.....6,13,19,24,46
Property, surplus...2,41,45
Public works..... 8
Purchasing..... 4
Reports..... 2
Research..... 38
Social security.....46
Soil conservation.15,18,21,43
Statistics.....5,46
Sugar.....14
Taxation.....10,35,46
Territories and possessions.....21,46,47
Trade, foreign.....46
Veterans' benefits..... 6
War powers..... 3
Wool.....39,46

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported agricultural appropriation bill. Bill to continue export-control, allocations, and priorities powers ready for President. House passed bill to amend and extend Sugar Act. Rep. Cooley discussed bill to transfer SCS functions to States. House received appropriation estimate for Remount Service. Sen. Thye submitted resolution for farm-program study. House committee reported bill to extend SCS, ACP, FHA programs to Virgin Islands. Senate debated tax-reduction bill. House committee approved bills to provide for wool-price supports and to amend peanut-quota provisions.

SENATE - July 11

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 3601 (S. Rept. 474)(p. 8830). For summary of Committee changes, see statement at end of this Digest.

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 3839 (S. Rept. 475)(p. 8830). The Committee added $400,000 for the Office of Government Reports, $25,000,000 for the War Assets Administration, $50,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers, and $75,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. Regarding the Office of Government Reports, the Committee report states: "This amount will allow continuation of the agency on a restricted basis. The Committee is of the opinion that this agency has overexpanded... A limitation of $7,500 per year has been placed on the salaries of personnel of the agency. The committee examined salaries presently in effect and it is the opinion, that for the type of work performed, the limitation is justified."

3. WAR POWERS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3647, to continue export-control, allocations, and priorities powers on a restricted basis (pp. 8841-3, 8887-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. PURCHASING. Received the GAO report under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (S. Doc. 75)(p. 8829).

5. STATISTICS. The Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 1497, to amend the act authorizing the Census Bureau to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and its products (S. Rept. 481)(p. 8830).

6. PERSONNEL. The Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 416, to extend veterans preference to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen (S. Rept. 480)(p. 8830).

7. PATENTS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3958, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the Patent Office with respect thereto (S. Rept. 502)(p. 8830).

8. PUBLIC-WORKS LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. 1487, to remove restrictions on loans by Federal agencies to finance construction of certain public works (S. Rept. 504)(p. 8830).

9. CONSUMER CREDIT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported an original measure, S. J. Res. 148, to authorize temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit (S. Rept. 473)(p. 8830).

10. TAXATION. Debated H. R. 3950, the tax-reduction bill (pp. 8833-8, 8844-63).

11. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Wherry, Nebr., spoke in favor of additional flood-control activities, discussing flood damage to farm lands (pp. 8838-9).

12. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Langer, N. Dak., criticized activities of the National Dairy Products Corp. (pp. 8865-78).

13. PERSONNEL. A Civil Service Subcommittee approved without amendment S. 1188, establishing retention preference regulations to employees permanently injured in line of duty, in making reductions in Government forces (p. D520).

HOUSE - July 11

14. SUGAR. Passed with amendment H. R. 4075, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1937 (pp. 8888-902). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Murray, Wis., to continue requirements for payment of fair wages on a modified basis (pp. 8888-92). Rejected amendments to continue the Act for 1 year only, to increase the domestic quota to 5,268,000 tons, to protect Puerto Rico refineries. Rejected, 47-101, a motion by Rep. Flannagan, Va., to recommit the bill with instruction that the Committee report it in a form continuing the Act for 1 year and providing for reallocation of any of the 1948 Philippine deficit in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 4075 (p. 8902).

15. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Gathings, Ark., spoke in favor of various increases in the agricultural appropriation bill, particularly for soil conservation (p. 8881).

16. NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3493 (pp. 8881-4).

17. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Johnson of Ind., Tibbott, Canfield, Griffiths, Cannon, Kirwan, and Andrews of Ala. were appointed House conferees on this bill, H. R. 3993 (p. 8902). Senate conferees were appointed July 10.

18. COORDINATION. Rep. Cooley, N. C., spoke in support of H. R. 4150 (see Digest 131) and explained that it provides for soil-conservation research through the

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The Senate Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this Bill, H. R. 3601 (S. Rept. 474). Representatives of the Department agencies have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions on the Budget estimates. Copies of the bill, report, and hearings will be distributed as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has already been worked out with the bureaus and offices. Except in case of unavoidable emergency, copies should be obtained through the bureau budget offices rather than from this office. General debate on the bill is expected to begin on the floor of the Senate today. (Note.--For the latest word on this point, please call B&F on Ext. 4654.) Taking all items into account, namely, direct appropriations in the bill, loan authorizations, and permanent appropriations, the Committee Bill provides a grand total of $1,048,266,136, which is $200,664,160 over the House Bill, $140,305,182 less that the Budget estimate, and $226,419,915 less than 1947 amounts. The table on the next page contains a summary comparison of the Committee actions with the House Bill.

Committee actions of special significance include: (1) increase of $92,385,710 over the House Bill for AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM (amount in the Bill, $258,000,000); (a) increase of $12,500,000 over the House Bill in the overall limitation on administrative expenses for this program (limitation in Senate Bill $27,500,000); (b) authorizes use of funds for formulation and administration of an Agricultural Conservation Program for the 1948 crop year in the amount of $150,000,000; (c) Senate Bill provides that payments to farmers under the 1947 program may be made upon the certificate of the claimant that he has carried out the conservation practices and complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payment; (2) increase of $8,000,000 over the House Bill in SECTION 32 funds for Section 32 purposes (amount in Senate Bill, $48,000,000, the Budget estimate); (3) increase of $30,000,000 over the House Bill for carrying out the provisions of the NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT, providing a total of $75,000,000 by transfer from Section 32 funds in lieu of the direct appropriation of $45,000,000 contained in the House Bill, deleted language of House Bill prohibiting consideration of funds derived from the sale of lunches as State or local contribution for matching purposes; (4) increase of $500,000 for RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946 and redistribution of the total amount of $9,500,000 as follows: (a) For payments to States, $2,500,000 (House Bill, $3,000,000); (b) For research on utilization and associated problems, $3,000,000 (House Bill, $2,500,000); (c) For cooperative research other than utilization research, $1,500,000 (Same as House Bill); (d) marketing research and service, $2,500,000 (House Bill, $2,000,000); (Distribution conforms to first year authorization in the Research and Marketing Act); (5) Restored the Budget estimate providing for an appropriation of $11,140,000 for MEAT INSPECTION and deleted language in House Bill establishing a working capital fund of $5,000,000 to be reimbursed from fees changed to packers; (6) Increase of $1,000,000 for FLOOD CONTROL to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers and their tributaries; (7) Provision of $20,000,000 for FARM TENANT LOANS for which no provision was made in the House Bill (Budget estimate, $35,000,000); (8) increase of $6,000,000 in administrative funds for

SENATE COMMITTEE ACTION ON 1948 AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

| | 1947 available funds | Budget Estimates 1948 | House Bill, 1948 | Senate Committee Bill, 1948 | Committee Bill compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct appropriations | $643,154,411 | $805,141,608 | $572,172,266 | $664,836,426 | +$92,664,160 |
| Reappropriations | 133,784,292 | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Permanent appropriations | 127,747,348 | 158,429,710 | 50,429,710 | 133,429,710 | +83,000,000 |
| Total appropriations and reappropriations | $904,686,051 | $963,571,318 | $622,601,976 | $798,266,136 | +$175,664,160 |
| Borrowings authorized: | | | | | |
| From RFC | 370,000,000 | 225,000,000 | - - | - - | - - |
| From U. S. Treasury | - - | - - | 225,000,000 | 250,000,000 | +25,000,000 |
| Grand totals, above items | $1,274,686,051 | $1,188,571,318 | $847,601,976 | $1,048,266,136 | +$200,664,160 |

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION (House Bill, $18,000,000); (9) increase of $25,000,000, providing the total Budget estimate of $250,000,000 for RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS (Total amount to be borrowed from U. S. Treasury); (10) increase of $1,000,000 in administrative funds for REA (House Bill, $4,000,000); (11) increase of $4,000,000 in the administrative funds for FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION and addition of language restricting the crop insurance program for 1948 and subsequent crop years to wheat, flax, and five additional crops, including corn, tobacco, and cotton in a limited number of counties, on an experimental basis; (12) Deleted language inserted by House pertaining to RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA and inserted new language providing $100,000 for research in Alaska in cooperation with the Alaska Experiment Station; (13) Inserted new Section 8 to General Provisions of Bill providing that limitations to be expended for personal services under appropriations in the Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments.

INCREASES OR DECREASES OVER HOUSE BILL CONTAINED IN SENATE COMMITTEE BILL:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Penalty mail | | +$300,000 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | | +500,000 |
| Office of Solicitor | | +200,000 |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics: | | |
| Economic investigations | | +500,000 |
| Agricultural Research Administration: | | |
| Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska | | -44,940 |
| Office of Experiment Stations: | | |
| Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico | | +44,940 |
| Bureau of Animal Industry: | | |
| Meat inspection | +6,140,000 | |
| Virus Serum Toxin Act | +50,000 | +6,190,000 |
| Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering: | | |
| Forest diseases | +20,000 | |
| Soils, fertilizers and irrigation | +100,000 | +120,000 |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: | | |
| Insect and plant disease control ($250,000 for pink bollworm control and $100,000 for Dutch-elm disease) | | +350,000 |
| Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics | | -245,000 |
| Forest Service: | | |
| National forest protection and management | +250,000 | |
| Forest products | +250,000 | |
| Forest resources investigations | +250,000 | |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests | +250,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Forest Roads and Trails: | | |
| Forest highways | +3,000,000 | |
| Forest development roads | +1,000,000 | +4,000,000 |
| Flood control | | +1,000,000 |
| Soil Conservation Service: | | |
| Soil conservation research | | +750,000 |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | | +92,385,710 |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (for Section 32 purposes) | | +8,000,000 |
| National School Lunch Act (Total provided for this Act, $75,000,000, made available from 1948 Section 32 funds) | | +30,000,000 |
| Administration of agricultural marketing agreements and orders (Entire item deleted in view of restoration of Section 32 funds) | | -525,300 |
| Marketing Services: | | |
| Market news service | +38,750 | |
| Marketing farm products | +100,000 | +138,750 |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | | +4,000,000 |
| Farmers' Home Administration: | | |
| Farm tenancy loans | +20,000,000 | |
| Salaries and expenses | +6,000,000 | +26,000,000 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rural Electrification Administration: | | |
| Salaries and expenses ..... | +1,000,000 | |
| Authorizations to borrow from Secretary of the Treasury ..... | +25,000,000 | +26,000,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Summary: | |
| Increase, appropriations ..... | +$221,479,400 |
| Increase, authorizations to borrow from Secretary of the Treasury ..... | +25,000,000 |
| Decrease, appropriations ..... | -45,815,240 |
| | +200,664,160 |

Please return to
DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE REPORTS
Office of Budget and Finance

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 93 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 11, 1947 No. 132

# Senate

(*Legislative day of Thursday, July 10, 1947*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast been the refuge of our fathers through many generations, be Thou our refuge in every time and circumstance of need. Be our guide today as we seek to find our way amongst the dark and difficult problems that confront our Nation "ere our footsteps stumble on the twilight hills." Help us ever to remember that the steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord.

So we ask for strength and wisdom for this day according to the promise, "As thy days so shall thy strength be." But we are all mere men, with temptations and cares that are the common lot of man. If any amongst us this day are distressed in spirit, or burdened with some secret anxiety, or if some sorrow has invaded our home and touched the ones we love, teach us how to "cast thy burden on the Lord and He shall sustain thee." Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 10, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, July 11, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946; and

S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3647) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REFUND OF TAXES TO CERTAIN MEXICAN RAILROAD WORKERS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### REPORT OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE UNDER CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944 (S. DOC. No. 75)

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the General Accounting Office under section 16 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiicary and ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

### AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act in connection with the payment of postage for unemployment compensation mail and payments to the States which have submitted plans under title I, IV, V, or X of such act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Capitol Post, No. 1, American Legion, Topeka, Kans., in which they urge the passage of the universal military training bill. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL POST, No. 1,
AMERICAN LEGION,
*Topeka, Kans., July 5, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: At the regular post membership meeting of July 3, 1947, the following resolution was adopted by Capitol Post, No. 1, American Legion, Topeka, Kans.:

"Whereas the American Legion and Capitol Post, No. 1, favor a program of national security for the good of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by Capitol Post, No. 1,* That the universal military training bill is a desirable and necessary part of the program for the security and defense of the United States of America, and that the members of this post individually and collectively urge the passage of said bill by the Congress; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from Kansas.

Very truly yours,
W. W. METZENTHIN,
*Commander.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on appropriations:

H. R. 3601. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 474).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 475).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1497. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 481).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 416. A bill to extend veterans preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen; with amendments (Rept. No. 480).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 476);

H. R. 3818. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 477);

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 478);

H. R. 4011. A bill to amend section 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 479); and

S. Res. 141. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the social-security program; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp; with an amendment (Rept. No. 485);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 486);

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Thomas Abadia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 487);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Julian Uriarte; without amendment (Rept. No. 482);

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Mary Sungduk Charr; without amendment (Rept. No. 483);

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Anna Kong Mei; without amendment (Rept. No. 484);

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Damian Gandiaga; with an amendment (Rept. No. 488);

H. R. 84. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 489);

H. R. 379. A bill for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng; without amendment (Rept. No. 490);

H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; without amendment (Rept. No. 491);

H. R. 553. A bill for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 492);

H. R. 555. A bill for the relief of Edna Rita Saffron Fidone; without amendment (Rept. No. 494);

H. R. 649. A bill for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui; without amendment (Rept. No. 493);

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hallquist; without amendment (Rept. No. 495);

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of Fred Pittelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 496);

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey; without amendment (Rept. No. 497);

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle; without amendment (Rept. No. 498);

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Anna Malama Mark; without amendment (Rept. No. 499);

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 500);

H. R. 3149. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces"; without amendment (Rept. No. 501);

H. R. 3958. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 502); and

S. Res. 137. Resolution to make an investigation of the immigration system; with an amendment (Rept. No. 503), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1487. A bill to remove restrictions upon loans by Federal agencies to finance the construction of certain public works; without amendment (Rept. No. 504).

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, and I submit a report (No. 473) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

REORGANIZATION OF DEBTOR RAILROAD CORPORATIONS — MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 432)

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the views of the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to accompany the bill (S. 249) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, heretofore reported from that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 11, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1609. A bill providing for the preservation of Fort Wayne Military Reservation, Detroit, Mich., for park use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. REVERCOMB (by request) introduced Senate bill 1610, to incorporate the Society of the First Division, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1611. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1612. A bill to reduce expenditures and to promote efficiency and economy in the auditing of customs transactions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1613. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act by repealing the restrictions therein on political expenditures; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1614. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic service of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER (by request):

S. 1615. A bill for the relief of William L. Cunliffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1616. A bill for the relief of Dyonisios Christ Pavlatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

INCORPORATION OF SOCIETY OF FIRST DIVISION

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have before me at this time a copy of a bill which I am about to introduce, which bears the title, "A bill to incorporate the Society of the First Division." I am introducing the bill by request. Under it, if it is reported favorably and passed by the Senate, a number of the outstanding leaders of the great and historic First Division of our Army will incorporate their society, for the membership of those who served so gallantly in that division. Among the incorporators are Gen. George C. Marshall, Lt. Gen. Clarence R. Huebner, and many other distinguished soldiers of this country. I now ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce the bill for proper reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1610) to incorporate the Society of the First Division, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB (by request), was received, read

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

80TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. ——

# AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

——————.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3601]

The Committee on Appropriations to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount of bill as passed House | [1] $572,172,266 |
| Amount of increase by Senate committee (net) | 91,564,160 |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate | 663,736,426 |
| Amount of appropriations, 1947 | 643,154,411 |
| Amount of estimates for 1948 | 805,141,608 |
| The bill as reported to the Senate: | |
| Under the estimates for 1948 | 141,405,182 |
| Exceeds the appropriations for 1947 | 20,582,015 |

[1] Includes estimated assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system of $2,781,000.

The committee recommends a total for direct appropriations in the bill of $663,736,426, which is $91,564,160 more than the amount of the direct appropriations in the bill as it passed the House.

The following table shows, in addition to direct appropriations, the permanent appropriations and loan authorizations available to the Department for 1948:

64166—47——1

*Summary of appropriations and loan authorizations in House bill, 1948, compared with 1947, and budget estimates, 1948*

| Item | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), House bill compared with— | | Senate bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Direct appropriations in agricultural appropriation bill | $643, 154, 411 | $805, 141, 608 | $572, 172, 266 | −$70, 982, 145 | −$232,969,342 | $663, 736, 426 | +$20, 582, 015 | −$141,405,182 | +$91, 564, 160 |
| Permanent appropriations | 127, 747, 348 | 158, 429, 710 | 50, 429, 710 | −77, 317, 638 | −108,000,000 | 133, 429, 710 | +5, 682, 362 | −25,000,000 | +83, 000, 000 |
| Total, direct appropriations | 770, 901, 759 | 963, 571, 318 | 622, 601, 976 | −148, 299, 783 | −340,969,342 | 797, 166, 136 | +26, 264, 377 | −166,405,182 | +174, 564, 160 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | | | −133, 784, 292 | | | −133, 784, 292 | | |
| Borrowings authorized: | | | | | | | | | |
| From RFC | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | | −370, 000, 000 | −225,000,000 | | −370, 000, 000 | −225,000,000 | |
| From Secretary of the Treasury | | | 225, 000, 000 | +225, 000, 000 | +225,000,000 | 250, 000, 000 | +250, 000, 000 | +250,000,000 | +25, 000, 000 |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations to borrow from RFC and Secretary of the Treasury | 1, 274, 686, 051 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 847, 601, 976 | −427, 084, 075 | −340,969,342 | 1, 047, 166, 136 | −227, 519, 915 | −141,405,182 | +199, 564, 160 |

As a result of 3 weeks of hearings held by the subcommittee which supplement the published hearings of the House, the committee submits the following comments pertaining to committee recommendations on the budget estimates and House bill:

## OFFICE OF SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The essential activities of the Department of Agriculture are reduced compared with the war period. Also, a reduction in various action programs is contemplated in the Senate bill, which follows, in part, the provisions of House bill 3601, pertaining to the agricultural appropriation bill. The recommended appropriation to the Office of the Secretary represents a large increase above that of the war years. The committee, therefore, supports the House in reducing the budget of $2,150,000 by the amount of $100,000, believing that necessary adjustments in administration can be made to conform to this action.

## PENALTY MAIL

An increase of 23 percent in the penalty-mail rate will more than offset the effect of any reduction of activities in the Department of Agriculture in the use of mail facilities. The committee, therefore, increases the House bill to $3,486,000 for penalty mail. While this is an increase of $300,000, the mail-rate increase would amount to $750,000 on the volume of mail issued by the Department in the past year. The Department of Agriculture, it is understood, is prepared to absorb a part of the increased rates by a reduction in volume of penalty mail.

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The committee recommends the appropriation of the sum of $9,500,000 for the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This amount represents the first year's increment authorized in the act, and it is further recommended that the distribution of this fund to the various purposes designated in the act shall be in the proportions indicated in the act. While the amount is $500,000 above that contained in the House bill and the distribution of the fund differs, it is believed that the committee action may conform to the intent of the House floor action.

While not convinced that satisfactory plans have been fully developed for the administration of research contemplated in the act to be used by the Department of Agriculture, the committee felt it unwise to change the distribution of the funds from the plans outlined in the act. While some of the State agricultural experiment stations may be in a position to proceed more rapidly with research contemplated under the act, others would lack the scientific personnel required to initiate the new research. A large fund made available immediately might create an undesirable competition in recruiting the required personnel; hence it is believed wise to permit the program to expand no more rapidly than contemplated when the act was enacted into law.

The committee considers that there is good reason for the Department of Agriculture to consider setting up a division apart from all

action and regulatory activities for the administration of the research contemplated under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The budget request of $2,525,000 for the Office of the Solicitor is reduced by $300,000. This is $200,000 above the amount carried in the House bill, as it was felt this amount was justified on the basis of past experience. The basis for this action is the reduced activity of the Department of Agriculture in work requiring the assistance of the Solicitor's Office and, furthermore, to encourage no more routine supervision of the Solicitor's Office than is essential to the work of the Department. Certain activities, such as rural-electrification cooperatives, need to be encouraged to accept as much responsibility for their own activities as they are capable of assuming and as procedures in such work as the Market Agreements Act become standardized, less routine attention on the part of the Solicitor's Office should expedite the work in the interest of all concerned.

### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee follows the recommendation of the House in reducing the budget for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Information by providing for an appropriation of $575,000, which is a decrease of $125,000 below the budget estimate. The committee agrees with the House committee that publicity activities of the Department can well be reduced in the interest of economy and more wholesome public relations.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The committee recommends a reduction of $250,000 to be applied to the economic investigations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, thus replacing $500,000 of the reduction made in the House bill which was regarded as too severe a reduction following a heavy cut in appropriations to this Bureau a year ago. The committee considers the work in crop and livestock estimates to be the most efficient organization of its kind and wishes to lend it full encouragement. It is believed, however, that the economic investigations can be reduced without impairing the Bureau's essential activities in assembling and interpreting economic information, or its cooperative relationships with the various States. These two interests, in particular, the committee feels, should be adequately financed to insure their efficiency in marshaling economic information essential to building sound economic programs for agriculture. It does not appeal to the committee, in line with the interest of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, that that fund should be used for new research, to expect that fund to carry the lines of work specifically mentioned above.

### OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The committee sustains the action of the House in reducing the budget estimate for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations from $728,000 to $428,000. The committee considers that the work of this Office has been handicapped by its close association with the Depart-

ment of State. On the other hand, it recognizes that it has an important function to perform in connection with the development of international trade relationships in agricultural products and markets for agricultural products, and therefore urges that careful direction be given to work in this field. In supporting the reduction imposed by the House, the committee does not wish to impair the essential duties of this Office from now until such time as the Office may become more efficiently organized in its relation to the State Department.

### AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

The need of appropriating the last authorized increment of the Bankhead-Jones agricultural extension fund of $4,000,000 was urgently presented to the committee by the State directors of the Agricultural Extension Service. Although authorized to be appropriated this year, the item was not included in the budget presented to Congress. Recognizing the benefits growing out of the Extension Service and the desirability of further support for the 4–H Clubs and other work with farm youth in particular, the committee would call attention to the reductions recommended for other agencies working with farm people and that they are giving their approval to the Extension Service by not reducing funds appropriated for this purpose.

### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

In the over-all view of the significance of research and the appropriation of funds authorized under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, some relatively small reductions in research are not in reality a reduction, since the added research funds will be available for new studies in these fields.

### SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND

The committee sustains the House reduction of $100,000 in the budget estimate of $1,303,000 in the special research fund. The Agricultural Research Administration will have added support from the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and should be able to absorb this small reduction in funds without impairing its work, especially since the Research and Marketing Act funds should be available to promote new lines of promising research.

### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY INSPECTION AND QUARANTINE

The amount of $1,225,197 contained in the House bill for animal inspection and quarantine is a larger amount than has been made available in any year prior to 1947. The committee feels that House action in reducing the budget item by $114,803 is sound.

### MEAT INSPECTION

The committee believes that the system of Federal meat inspection has contributed to the health of the public through eliminating seriously diseased animals from 75 percent of the publicly slaughtered meat animals. If the cost of inspection were shifted to the packers, it is believed that many small packers would forego inspection and

limit their trade to intrastate channels. Therefore, in the best interest of the public, the committee sustains the budget estimate, appropriating $11,140,000 for meat inspection as opposed to the House bill plan to place Federal meat inspection on a fee basis to be paid by the packers.

### VIRUS SERUM TOXIN ACT

The testimony presented pertaining to virus serum toxin inspection and regulation indicated that this work is vitally associated with the animal industry of the Nation and the need for its support was strongly urged by the foremost serum and virus producers. The committee, therefore, decided that full support of the budget item in the amount of $340,000 was justified, thus restoring the cut imposed by the House.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

The committee is in accord with the House bill in reducing the budget estimate for the Bureau of Dairy Industry by $125,000 to the amount of $1,011,000, which represents a material increase over any preceding year except 1947. It was recognized that livestock-breeding experimentation might easily be permitted to expand unless kept under control.

### FOREST DISEASES

The committee restored $20,000 of the budget reduction imposed by the House bill to be applied, in particular, to the work with chestnut diseases, which leaves an amount of $379,280 for forest diseases. This exceeds the appropriation of previous years for forest diseases, and the committee would permit the Bureau to distribute the total appropriation for forest diseases in accordance with its judgment.

### SOILS, FERTILIZERS, AND IRRIGATION

The committee restored $100,000 to the budget for soils, fertilizers, and irrigation. This represents an appropriation of $1,491,000, or $100,000 in excess of the House bill. While the Bureau should distribute the total appropriation in the best interest of agriculture, the committee felt that the various irrigation and dry-land experiment stations proposed for closing under the conditions of the House bill should be maintained until the respective States are given adequate opportunity to provide funds for their operation. At least part of these stations have permanent values to the States concerned and they should have the opportunity of providing support for them and to accept the responsibility for them.

### NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Funds for the National Arboretum were approved in the amount of $436,900 in accordance with the House recommendation. This affords the necessary funds for acquiring additional land and to continue development work, but delays the construction of buildings, roads, and other improvements until such construction can be accomplished with more ample supplies of materials and labor at less cost.

### SPECIAL DISEASE STUDIES

The committee felt that the requests for work on the control of the sclerotina disease on beans in Florida and diseases of mushrooms could receive attention from the appropriations to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering.

### INSECT INVESTIGATIONS

The committee concurs with the House action in reducing the budget estimate for insect investigations $188,700 which gives the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine the sum of $2,961,300 or a total amount of money in excess of the total appropriation for 1947. While some reduction in research may be necessary, it should not eliminate any essential activity and represents a measure of economy. It is understood that adjustments can be made which will make it possible to retain work on insect identification and classification, and to retain the major part of the investigations of insects affecting men and animals, and general control investigations.

### INSECT AND PLANT-DISEASE CONTROL

Recognizing in particular the menace of the pink boll worm along the Mexican border, the committee recommends that $250,000 be restored in the cut contained in the House bill. This would provide a budget of $2,947,100, which exceeds any previous appropriations except that of 1947. The control of the Dutch elm disease apparently has not proven effective and experimental and research work on this disease rather than control operations need to be emphasized. The need of resurveying areas that have been covered in barberry eradication work in recent years was recognized as a need which might require effective action and an increased appropriation in the appropriation bill of next year.

### CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

The committee supports the action of the House in reducing the budget item of $2,800,000 to $2,050,000 for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases since the Bureau proposes the early termination of control work on the pear Psylla and since serious outbreaks may be taken care of from deficiency appropriations.

### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $305,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia and a total of $800,000 for the work of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which is a reduction of $245,000 below the budget estimate and the House bill. The work of the Bureau was greatly expanded during the war and the recommended appropriation greatly exceeds that of any preceding year.

### WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

The House reduction of $250,000 below the Budget estimates has been accepted. The committee, however, proposes that the Bureau

of Entomology and Plant Quarantine distribute this reduction between the projects carried on under its direction rather than to apply it to the single project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction as indicated in the report of the House committee.

### FOREST SERVICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee supports the House action in reducing the budget by $32,000, which represents a small reduction.

### NATIONAL FOREST PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $24,014,891 is approved for national forest protection and management which is $250,000 above the House recommendation. This increased amount is designated for unit-management work which it is felt needs emphasis because of some lack of attention during the war. And, also, to develop the Lake Tahoe recreational area.

### FOREST AND RANGE MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATIONS

The committee sustains the House reduction of $200,000 from the budget estimate of $2,675,000 for forest and range management investigations, which leaves a larger appropriation for this purpose than in any prior year except 1947.

### FOREST PRODUCTS INVESTIGATIONS

The committee restored $250,000 of the $555,000 reduction recommended by the House. This was done to speed up research pertaining to the utilization of waste material in the lumber industry, recognizing that the actual waste exceeds in amount the proportion of the tree that is made into lumber.

### FOREST RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS

The House recommendation of $572,000 was increased to $822,000, which is still $250,000 below the budget. Many States are ready to cooperate with the Forest Service in conducting surveys or appraisals of their forest resources. The committee believes the recommended appropriation will expedite this work.

### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $750,000 for the acquisition of forest land, or an increase of $250,000 above the House recommendation, with the provision that the administrative cost of such acquisition is to be met from the appropriation for "National forest protection and management."

### FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The committee recommends an increase over the House bill from $10,000,000 to $11,000,000 for forest road development and from $5,300,000 to $8,300,000 for forest highways, or a total of $19,300,000, as compared to the budget figure of $23,800,000. The committee is

aware of improvements needed in badly worn roads as well as new road construction, but feels with the existing high costs of construction that the recommendations are generous.

### SOIL-CONSERVATION RESEARCH

The committee has restored the budget estimate for soil-conservation research by returning $750,000 removed in the House bill. The committee feels strongly that more research is urgently needed as a basis for developing sound soil-conservation action in the field. Furthermore, the various State agricultural experiment stations have felt this need so keenly that a number are more than matching the Federal funds for new research pertaining to soil conservation.

### SOIL-CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

The committee sustains the House action in approving $38,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, which is a reduction of $5,437,000 from the budget estimate. This action is taken because the committee feels that the Service has expanded rapidly and that much remains to be gained in effective field operation. The apparent duplication of services to farmers should be correlated into a more unified plan of action in the field on a basis that will give due consideration to all aspects of a progressive agriculture developed in the interest of all of society.

### LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

The committee supports the House bill of $1,660,000 for Land Utilization and Retirement of Submarginal Land compared to the budget estimate of $3,260,000, believing that these provisions will care for critical needs and that some of the work proposed under this item should await more favorable construction conditions.

### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The committee takes exception to the House bill provisions for the agricultural program. The committee recognizes the obligation resting upon Congress by virtue of the authorization by Congress last year of an agricultural "Conservation and use of agricultural resources" program for 1947 and provides for carrying out that program by appropriating the amount of $258,000,000. This amount, together with the surplus of approximately $37,000,000 carried over from the 1946 program, will provide $267,620,754 estimated to be needed to make the payments to farmers authorized a year ago and leave approximately $27,500,000 for the administration of the program. While this procedure does not provide a carry-over fund to initiate the 1948 program, the Department of Agriculture has a standing authorization to borrow $50,000,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation to assist in carrying the program until the succeeding appropriation becomes available.

The committee further recognizes that Congress is considering the development of a future agricultural program, but believes that until such time as a new program is developed there should be a continuing program similar to the one now in operation. To that end the com-

mittee recommends the authorization of an agricultural program for 1948 in the amount of $150,000,000 to cover the payments to farmers and the administration of the program. The authorization is offered in recognition of the desirability of continuing to focus attention upon the importance of soil conservation and to supplement the educational and demonstrational work in this field. During this period of high farm prices, the committee feels that the farmer can afford to contribute a larger proportion of the cost of soil-conserving practices during 1948 but that the work should continue to receive encouragement and that the organization to conduct the program should be maintained. Also there are other essential duties including crop insurance, and surplus commodity removal operations, to be performed at the county level. The committee believes its action will effect economies in administration without serious detriment to the desired objectives.

### NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH ACTIVITIES

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $75,000,000 for school-lunch activities which is $30,000,000 above the House bill and directs that $75,000,000 be used from section 32 funds for this purpose. It is also recommended that funds derived from the sale of lunches to children may be used as matching funds for Federal appropriations for the ensuing year. This action is deemed advisable because few State legislatures are still in session so that they can take action in matching Federal funds with State appropriations. The committee wishes to put itself on record, however, urging that State appropriations be made to match Federal funds in the proportions set forth in the National School Lunch Act.

### MARKETING FARM PRODUCTS

The committee increases the House bill appropriation of $1,000,000 to $1,100,000 for marketing farm products. This increase is intended to expedite the transportation of farm products particularly with reference to continuing the surveys of shipping and storage space requirements to handle farm products. Information available to the committee indicates that this service has been useful and should be continued.

### UNITED STATES WAREHOUSE ACT

The committee sustains the House action in reducing the budget item of $685,000 for the administration of the United States Warehouse Act to $585,000, which it considers to be adequate.

### COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

The committee sustains the House bill in reducing the budget estimate of $650,000 for the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act to $530,000, believing this amount is sufficient for the administration of this act.

### FARM TENANT LOANS

The committee restores the fund for farm tenant loans to $20,000,000 which had been eliminated by the House, although the budget requests

was for $35,000,000. The committee, further, requests that priority be given to veterans who apply for loans but admonishes the Farmers' Home Administration to avoid loaning on values which seem likely to lead to the financial disaster of the borrowers. Land prices have risen over 100 percent in the past 10 years in many States and represent heavy inflation compared to prewar years in many areas. It must be recognized that the reported good record of tenant farm purchase activities has been due to the deflated land prices of 15 years ago, and a continually rising price level for farm products over many years and abnormal prices during the war years. Therefore, it would seem a matter of prudence for the Administration to be less active in farm loan activities in many areas and to be continually on guard against excessive prices that are likely to bring disaster to borrowers who have little capital, and discredit to the program itself.

### PRODUCTION AND SUBSISTENCE LOANS

The committee concurs with the House bill in reducing the budget estimate of $90,000,000 to $60,000,000 for production and subsistence loans by the Farmers Home Administration. With the period of good production and prices for agricultural products an increasing number of the clients of the Farmers Home Administration should become eligible for loans from other sources especially when loan funds are plentiful in the hands of private lenders.

### INSURED MORTGAGES

The committee concurs with the House in limiting the fund for insured mortgages to $1,000,000 since the testimony by officials of the Farmers Home Administration indicated that there had been no interest in loans insured on the basis specified in the act.

### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee restored $6,000,000 of the $12,000,000 House reduction from the budget estimates of $30,000,000. With the volume of loans outstanding and with the understanding that special effort will be given to clearing long standing feed, seed, and drouth loans, in particular, there seems to be justification for the recommendation of the committee.

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $250,000,000 for loan funds to rural electrification cooperatives, with the provision that the full amount shall be borrowed directly from the Secretary of the Treasury. This procedure will enable saving three-fourths of 1 percent formerly paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which will increase the payments from the cooperatives to the Treasury by approximately $4,280,000 annually on loans now outstanding. The fact that 15 percent of the loan funds to the Rural Electrification Cooperatives have been direct appropriations has placed the loans now made to the cooperatives in a strong collateral position, justifying this change in procedure.

The committee emphasizes the importance of giving electric service to groups of farmers in greatest need and admonishes the administration not to engage in power line or generator construction where such service can be obtained at reasonable cost of power.

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee reduced the budget estimate of $5,600,000 to $5,000,000 or $1,000,000 in excess of the House bill. The volume of work of this administration is near a peak which justifies strong support, but the committee believes there has been undue extravagance in salaries considering the experience and training of personnel. The committee, therefore, admonishes the administration to make the major economy in the budget by down-grading or eliminating the high-salaried positions rather than to eliminate employees in the lower grades of salaries.

### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee recommends $5,000,000 in place of the budget estimate of $9,330,000 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. There is pending legislation in each House providing for new crop insurance programs, which will probably replace the experimental program proposed by the Department of Agriculture. The fact that there are 540,000 crop insurance contracts outstanding makes it imperative that funds be made available for continued administration of the program. The recommendation of the committee is considered adequate to meet the needs of the administration of the existing act and to continue an experimental program.

### SECTION 32 FUNDS

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $48,000,000 for the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, which is an increase of $8,000,000 above the House action. This increase will make it unnecessary to make a direct appropriation for the administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, for which the House bill provided $525,500. The administrative expenses for the act would under this proposal be made available from a 4 percent allowance for administration from the amount of section 32 funds appropriated to the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities.

### INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

## Title I—General appropriations

Penalty mail ..... $300,000

Research and Marketing Act of 1946:

For research on utilization and associated problems ..... 500,000

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products ..... 500,000

The committee recommends a readjustment of the amounts provided in the House bill so as to bring them into conformity with the authorization set forth in the act. An increase is recommended of $500,000 in all for a total of $9,500,000, distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| For payments to States (a reduction of $500,000) | $2,500,000 |
| For research on utilization (an increase of $500,000) | 3,000,000 |
| For cooperative research (to remain the same amount) | 1,500,000 |
| For improvement and development of distribution and marketing system (an increase of $500,000) | 2,500,000 |
| | 9,500,000 |

The amount recommended in all is half of the authorization and estimate of $19,000,000.

The committee also recommends that the following provision be deleted:

of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching requirement;

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

: *Provided, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said Act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out "authorized to be appropriated under section 9 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a)"*

Office of the Solicitor ..... 200,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for necessary expenses.

The committee also recommends a decrease in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $97,000, for a total of $1,500,000.

Printing and binding:

The committee recommends that the following proviso be stricken from the bill:

"for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection therewith",

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

*to carry into effect the terms of section 23 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32.*

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation on the amount to be transferred of $74,700, to provide for a total of $170,000.

## Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Economic investigations ..... $500,000

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $500,000, for a total of $2,387,000 for the limitation.

## Agricultural Research Administration:

Bureau of Animal Industry:

Meat inspection ..... 6,140,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide the estimate of $11,140,000.

The committee recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be

## Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

included in the budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further,* That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

Virus Serum Toxin Act ..... $50,000

The committee recommends the increase to provide the full amount of the estimate for carrying out the provisions of the act of $340,000.

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau of $2,840, for a total of $1,061,840 for limitation.

Total, Bureau of Animal Industry ..... 6,190,000

## Bureau of Dairy Industry:

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $40,912, to provide a total of $540,912 for the limitation.

## Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:

Forest diseases ..... 20,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for investigations and research on chestnut diseases, including breeding, testing, and propagating blight-resistant hybrids.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation ..... 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to be allocated by the Department.

Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, etc ..... 120,000

## Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:

Insect and plant disease control ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for work on control and prevention of spread of the pink bollworm of cotton.

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $17,440, to provide a total of $709,440 for the limitation.

Total, Agricultural Research Administration ..... 6,560,000

## Forest Service:

National forest protection and management ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for general management, operation, and regulation of national forest properties, of which $25,000 is to provide funds for construction of necessary sanitary and other recreational facilities on the Lake Tahoe recreation area.

Forest products ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for experiments, investigations, and tests to be allocated by the Department.

## Forest Service—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Forest resources investigations | $250,000 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for survey and investigations, to be allocated by the Department. | |
| The committee also recommends an increase of $28,000 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia, to provide a total of $1,083,378 for the limitation. | |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests | 250,000 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for the acquisition of forest land under the Weeks Act. | |
| The committee further recommends that the following be stricken from the bill: | |
| to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired. | |
| and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof: | |
| *; the administrative cost of such acquisition to be met from the appropriation "National forest protection and management"* | |
| Total, Forest Service | 1,000,000 |

## Forest Roads and Trails:

| | |
|---|---|
| Forest development roads and trails | 1,000,000 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service Administration, to provide a total of $11,000,000, which is $1,500,000 below the estimate of $12,500,000. | |
| Forest highways | 3,000,000 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for carrying out the provisions of sec. 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to provide a total of $8,300,000, which is $3,000,000 below the estimate of $11,300,000. | |
| The committee also recommends an increase of $9,530 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia, to provide a total of $109,530 for the limitation. | |
| Total, Forest roads and trails | 4,000,000 |

## Soil Conservation Service:

| | |
|---|---|
| Soil conservation research | 750,000 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for research and investigations, to provide the budget estimate of $1,423,000. | |
| The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $36,500, to provide a total of $875,000 for the limitation. | |

Production and Marketing Administration:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources ..... 92, 385, 710

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be deleted from the bill:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation or administration of any 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to marketing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming

Production and Marketing Administration—Con.

practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That where farmer participation in the program in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

and that the following paragraph be inserted thereof: in lieu

*For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of*

Production and Marketing Administration—Con.

*the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,109,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary pay prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, provided that the proportion going to a State shall not be changed more than 15 percent from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: Providing further, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural*

## Production and Marketing Administration—Continued

*conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: Provided further, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: Provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.*

## Marketing Services:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Market news service | | $38,750 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for the following: | | |
| To provide for market news service on wholesale dressed meat on the west coast, at Los Angeles and at Portland | $25,000 | |
| To provide for market news service on cheese and related products in Wisconsin | 13,750 | |
| Total | 38,750 | |

The committee also recommends, after the words "dairy and poultry products", the addition of the following:

*(including broilers)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Marketing farm products | 100,000 |

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $1,100,000 for carrying out the program, which is $300,000 below the estimate of $1,400,000.

The committee also recommends an increase of $75,000 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia for Marketing Services, for a total of $2,286,000 for the limitation.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total, Marketing Services | 138,750 |

Commodity Exchange Authority:

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $12,000, to provide a total of $153,000 for the limitation.

Farmers Home Administration:

Farm tenant loans ..... $20,000,000

The committee recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

For loans under

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

*Title I and section 43, $20,000,000*

In recommending this increase, the committee is of the opinion that first priority should be given to applications from veterans.

Salaries and expenses ..... 6,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses of the Administration.

Total, Farmers Home Administration ..... 26,000,000

Rural Electrification Administration:

Salaries and expenses ..... 1,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, with the admonishment to the Administration that economies should be effected by reducing the higher-grade employees rather than the lower-grade employees.

Loans:

The committee recommends that the authorization to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury be increased from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000.

General provisions:

Terminal-leave payments.

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill:

*Sec. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).*

## Title II—Government corporations

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation ..... 4,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for operating expenses, to provide a total of $5,000,000.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be added to the bill:

*: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-seven counties, in accordance with Section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of Section 508 (a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation.*

## Title III—Reduction in appropriation

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities:

The committee recommends an increase of $8,000,000 in the limitation on the amount of funds to be available during 1948 for use in effectuating the purposes of the 1935 act, to provide a total of $48,000,000 of available sec. 32 funds.

Total increases ..... $137,834,460

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Research and Marketing Act of 1946:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations ..... $500,000

The committee recommends a decrease in this program in order to readjust the amount in conformity with the authorization in the Act, as explained under the items for increases, to provide a total of $2,500,000.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska:

The committee recommends that the following paragraphs be deleted from the bill:

To enable the Secretary, through such officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Territory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and with other public and private agencies. The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities hereunder. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than any land in general use heretofore for other university purposes, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable continue the employment of the existing personnel of the station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended balances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature or acquired under authority of law for the construction, use, and development of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, the availability of such

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

funds to be unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the transfer.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

and that the following paragraphs be inserted in lieu thereof:

*RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA*

*To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings*

## Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

*and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.*

### *Office of Experiment Stations*

#### *PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO*

*For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:*

*Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7. U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,663,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.*

#### *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

*Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.*

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics..... $245,000

The reduction recommended by the committee is in the necessary expenses for conducting the program.

The committee also recommends a reduction in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $76,700, for a total of $305,000 for the limitation.

Flood control:

The committee recommends that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

*Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior-year balances.

National School Lunch Act ..... $45,000,000

The committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

and that the following be inserted under title III on sec. 32 funds:

*To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c) ), such amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act.*

Administration of agricultural marketing agreements and orders ..... 525,300

The committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total decreases | 46,270,300 |
| Total increase | 137,834,460 |
| Total decrease | 46,270,300 |
| Net increase | 91,564,160 |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate | 663,736,426 |

O

[SUBCOMMITTEE PRINT]

Calendar No.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. ]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY , 1947

Reported by Mr. _____, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

1 TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For personal services in the office of the Secretary of
5 Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary,
6 in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other neces-
7 sary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to
8 exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses,
9 including examination of estimates for appropriations in the
10 field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight,
11 express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication
12 service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and
13 other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise pro-
14 vided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of
15 the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred
16 to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such
17 amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are
18 provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal
19 year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or
20 portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not
21 exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and
22 made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That
23 if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations
24 for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall
25 below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the

1 Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be trans-
2 ferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or
3 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
5 the Department shall determine are appropriate to the re-
6 quirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such
7 appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That, of
8 appropriations herein made which are available for the pur-
9 chase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each
10 option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land:
11 *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by
12 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or
13 employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee,
14 or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission,
15 or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any predic-
16 tion, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threat-
17 ened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future
18 prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further*,
19 That, except to provide materials required in or incident to
20 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
21 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this
22 Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured
23 from commodities or materials produced outside of the United
24 States.

## PENALTY MAIL

For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944 (39 U. S. C. 321d), ~~$3,186,000~~ *$3,486,000.*

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including in addition to the objects for which funds are available for such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration, planning, and coordination of research under section 10 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Act, as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, ~~$3,000,000~~ *$2,500,000,* ~~of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and make a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching requirement~~*: Provided, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said Act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out "authorized to*

1 *be appropriated under section 9 (a)" and inserting in lieu*
2 *thereof "appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a)";*
3 For research on utilization and associated problems
4 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, ~~$2,500,000~~ *$3,-*
5 *000,000;*
6 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
7 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
8 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act, $1,500,000;
9 For the improvement and development, independently or
10 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
11 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
12 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
13 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
14 14, 1946), ~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,500,000;*
15 In all, ~~$9,000,000~~ *$9,500,000*: *Provided,* That such
16 sums as may be necessary for penalty mail as required by the
17 Act of June 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular
18 departmental appropriation therefor: *Provided further,* That
19 for necessary printing and binding there may be transferred
20 to, and made a part of, the item "Printing and binding,
21 Department of Agriculture," such sums as are necessary:
22 *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to
23 any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts
24 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the
25 functions for which it is made, and any such amounts shall

be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, ~~$2,025,000~~ *$2,225,000,* together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed ~~$1,597,000~~ *$1,500,000*: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau

1 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
2 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
3 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases
4 in such appropriations or authorizations.

5 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
8 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
9 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
10 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
11 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
12 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
13 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
14 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
15 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
16 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
17 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
18 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
19 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
20 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
21 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
22 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
23 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
25 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-

1 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
2 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
3 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be
4 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
5 which may be expended for personal services in the District
6 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
7 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
8 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
9 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
10 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
11 tions: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that
12 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
13 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
14 of the various agencies of the Department can be more ad-
15 vantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
16 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
17 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
18 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
19 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
20 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
21 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in
22 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
23 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
24 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
25 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944

1 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
2 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
3 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*
4 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
5 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
6 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
7 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
8 Francisco radio office.

9 PRINTING AND BINDING

10 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
11 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
12 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
13 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
14 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
15 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
16 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
17 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
18 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
19 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
20 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
21 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
22 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent
23 out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators,
24 Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall

1 direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants
2 of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on
3 Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
5 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
6 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
7 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
8 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
9 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
10 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
11 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
12 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
13 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
14 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
15 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
16 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
17 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
18 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
19 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
20 ~~for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing~~
21 ~~Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d), such~~
22 ~~sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in con-~~
23 ~~nection therewith~~ *to carry into effect the terms of section 23*
24 *of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as*
25 *amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and*

1 *binding in connection with the activities under section 32*:
2 *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be trans-
3 ferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso
4 shall not exceed ~~$95,300~~ *$170,000.*

5 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

6 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
7 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,
8 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
9 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
10 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
11 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
12 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
13 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
14 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

16 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
17 ~~$1,887,000~~ *$2,387,000* for personal services in the Dis-
18 trict of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at
19 $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the
20 purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers,
21 as follows:

22 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
23 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
24 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
25 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation

1 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
2 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
3 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
4 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
5 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
6 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
7 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
8 their variations and trends, ~~$1,743,600~~ *$2,243,600*: *Pro-*
9 *vided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated or
10 made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
11 under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used
12 for State and county land-use planning, for conducting
13 cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.
14 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
15 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
16 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
17 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
18 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
19 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
20 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
21 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
22 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
23 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
24 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided,*

1 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-
2 able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or
3 publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
4 acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
5 production for other than the commercial crop.

6 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
7 RELATIONS

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the
9 Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling
10 the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the
11 Department in connection with foreign agricultural work,
12 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
13 not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $428,000.

14 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
15 COMMITTEES

16 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
17 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
18 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
19 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
20 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
21 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
22 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
23 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
24 thereto.

1 EXTENSION SERVICE

2 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO

3 RICO

4 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
5 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
6 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
7 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
8 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
9 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
10 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
11 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
12 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
13 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
14 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
15 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
16 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
17 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
18 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
19 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
20 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
21 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
22 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
23 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
24 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2 Administration and coordination of extension work:
3 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
4 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341-
5 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
6 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
7 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
8 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
13 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
14 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
16 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
17 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
18 to the Department, from Government surplus without
19 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
20 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
21 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
22 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
23 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
24 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*

1 That the appropriation current at the time services are
2 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
3 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
4 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
5 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
6 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
7 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
8 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
9 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center
10 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
11 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
12 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
13 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
14 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
15 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
16 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
17 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
18 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
19 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
20 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
21 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
22 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
23 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
24 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
25 tor, whichever is greater.

1 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
2 AGRICULTURE

3 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
4 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
5 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
6 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
7 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
8 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by
9 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
10 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
11 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
12 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
13 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
14 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
15 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

16 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
17 MATERIALS

18 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
19 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
20 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
21 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
22 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
23 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
24 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of

1 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
2 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
3 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
4 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
5 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
6 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
7 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
8 $865,000.

9 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

10 ~~To enable the Secretary, through such officers and~~
11 ~~employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-~~
12 ~~tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain~~
13 ~~a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and~~
14 ~~problems of the Territory of Alaska $144,940, including~~
15 ~~printing and binding, the employment of personal services~~
16 ~~in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-~~
17 ~~tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to~~
18 ~~restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program~~
19 ~~the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have~~
20 ~~heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the~~
21 ~~Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station~~
22 ~~of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United~~
23 ~~States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and~~
24 ~~with other public and private agencies. The provisions of~~

1 ~~this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of~~
2 ~~the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take~~
3 ~~such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine~~
4 ~~to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-~~
5 ~~under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use~~
6 ~~of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds~~
7 ~~of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including~~
8 ~~its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than~~
9 ~~any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-~~
10 ~~poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable~~
11 ~~continue the employment of the existing personnel of the~~
12 ~~station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-~~
13 ~~cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby~~
14 ~~transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-~~
15 ~~ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for~~
16 ~~credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the~~
17 ~~legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-~~
18 ~~struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-~~
19 ~~tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be~~
20 ~~unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall~~
21 ~~be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-~~
22 ~~tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the~~
23 ~~transfer.~~

1 ~~OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS~~

2 ~~PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO~~

3 ~~For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico~~
4 ~~to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the~~
5 ~~provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural~~
6 ~~experiments stations:~~

7 ~~Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related~~
8 ~~Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.~~
9 ~~C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), $720,000; Adams Act,~~
10 ~~the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),~~
11 ~~$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,~~
12 ~~1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373, 376, 380, 382),~~
13 ~~$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-~~
14 ~~proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), $2,661,268,~~
15 ~~none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the~~
16 ~~Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b),~~
17 ~~extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the~~
18 ~~Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act~~
19 ~~approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d-~~
20 ~~386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress~~
21 ~~to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,~~
22 ~~and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.~~

23 ~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

24 ~~Administration of grants and coordination of research~~
25 ~~with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed~~

~~$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-369, 370-383, 386, 386d-386f); relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.~~

*To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.*

1 *Office of Experiment Stations*

2 *PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND*

3 *PUERTO RICO*

4 *For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*
5 *Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect*
6 *the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural*
7 *experiment stations:*

8 *Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related*
9 *Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U.*
10 *S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams*
11 *Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),*
12 *$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,*
13 *1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380,*
14 *382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act*
15 *approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),*
16 *$2,663,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928*
17 *(7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain*
18 *Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000;*
19 *Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.*
20 *386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Terri-*
21 *tory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of*
22 *the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), ex-*
23 *tending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the*
24 *Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500;*
25 *Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended*

1 *(70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain*
2 *Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments*
3 *to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.*
4 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*
5 *Administration of grants and coordination of research*
6 *with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed*
7 *$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia,*
8 *to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,*
9 *1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16,*
10 *1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20,*
11 *1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363,*
12 *365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and*
13 *for the administration of an agricultural experiment*
14 *station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall*
15 *prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required*
16 *under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are*
17 *in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research*
18 *work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment sta-*
19 *tions in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of*
20 *the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon*
21 *to Congress.*
22 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
23 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
24 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
25 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

1 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
4 ~~$1,059,000~~ *$1,061,840* for departmental personal services
5 in the District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
6 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
7 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned
8 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
9 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

10 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
11 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
12 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
13 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
14 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
15 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
16 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

17 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
18 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
19 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.

20 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
21 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
22 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
23 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
24 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
25 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-

1 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
2 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
3 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
4 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
5 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
6 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
7 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
8 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That
9 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
10 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
11 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
12 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
13 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
14 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
15 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
16 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
17 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

18 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
19 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
20 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
21 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
22 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
23 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
24 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance

with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, $1,225,197.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, ~~$5,000,000~~ *$11,140,000*, ~~for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and~~

1 ~~other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia~~
2 ~~and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal~~
3 ~~Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District~~
4 ~~of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger~~
5 ~~motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase~~
6 ~~of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized~~
7 ~~by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary~~
9 ~~of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of~~
10 ~~bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the~~
11 ~~interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-~~
12 ~~draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges~~
13 ~~or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-~~
14 ~~ment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical~~
15 ~~services may be rendered to Government and other public~~
16 ~~agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein~~
17 ~~provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations~~
18 ~~and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the~~
19 ~~close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for~~
20 ~~the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the~~
21 ~~Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*~~
22 ~~*further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service~~
23 ~~rendered on and after July 1, 1947.~~

24 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
25 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),

1 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
2 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
3 factured in the United States and the importation of such
4 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
5 animals, ~~$290,000~~ *$340,000.*

6 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
7 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
8 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
9 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
10 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
11 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
12 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
13 services in the District of Columbia.

14 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
15 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

16 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
17 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-
18 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
19 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
20 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
21 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
22 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
23 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
24 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
25 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar

1 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
2 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
3 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
4 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
5 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
6 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
7 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
8 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
9 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
10 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
11 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
12 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
13 United States Government for any such animals shall not
14 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
15 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
16 appraisal is the same for each bird.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
19 not to exceed ~~$500,000~~ *$540,912* for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act
21 of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investiga-
22 tions, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry,
23 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May
24 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or
25 renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946

1 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S.
2 C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process
3 or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

4 For repair of buildings, fence, electric line and feed
5 bunk, recently damaged by tornado at the dairy field station,
6 Woodward, Oklahoma, $5,300.

7 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
8 ENGINEERING

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
12 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
13 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
14 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
15 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
16 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
17 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
18 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
19 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
20 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
21 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
22 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
23 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
24 as follows:

25 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-

1 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn
2 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
3 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
4 field crops, $2,784,000.

5 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
6 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
7 table, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
8 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
9 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
10 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
11 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
12 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
13 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
14 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
15 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dade
16 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
17 mately $7,000.

18 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
19 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
20 control, ~~$359,280~~ *$379,280.*

21 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
22 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
23 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
24 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
25 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural

1 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
2 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
3 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
4 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
5 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
6 cropping and improved soil management; ~~$1,391,000~~
7 *$1,491,000.*

8 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
9 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
10 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
11 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
12 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
13 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
14 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
15 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
16 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

17 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
18 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
19 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
20 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
21 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
22 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
23 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
24 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of

1 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act
2 of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).
3 Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement
4 and repair of buildings, equipment and supplies, utilities,
5 fences and other general repairs and clean-up operations
6 from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward,
7 Oklahoma, $45,600.

8 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
12 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means
13 of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agri-
14 culture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
15 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
16 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
17 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
18 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the
19 provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
20 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7
21 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
22 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and
23 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the
24 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious

1 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-
2 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
3 and not to exceed ~~$692,000~~ *$709,440* for personal services
4 in the District of Columbia, as follows:

5 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
6 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
7 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
8 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
9 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
10 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
11 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
12 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
13 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
14 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
15 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
16 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
17 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
18 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
19 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
20 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
21 tion, $2,961,300.

22 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
23 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
24 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,

1 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal
2 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
3 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
4 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
5 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
6 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
7 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
8 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
9 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
10 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
11 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
12 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
13 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
14 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), ~~$2,697,100~~ $3,047,100 ~~$2,947,100~~:
15 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to
16 pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or
17 other property injured or destroyed: *Provided further*, That,
18 in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropria-
19 tion shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil
20 in any State until such State has provided cooperation neces-
21 sary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication
22 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
23 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
24 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
25 tions for the accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided fur-*

1 *ther,* That in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures
2 from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods
3 of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where meas-
4 ures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
5 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
6 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
7 or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor
8 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
9 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State,
10 county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations
11 concerned: *Provided, however,* That expenditures incurred for
12 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
13 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
14 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further,*
15 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
16 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
17 disease except where such trees are located on property
18 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
19 or on property included within local experimental control
20 areas.

21 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
22 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
23 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
24 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
25 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7

1 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
2 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
3 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
4 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
5 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
6 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
8 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
9 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
10 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
11 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

12 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
13 PLANT DISEASES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
16 148–148e); including the operation and maintenance of air-
17 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys
18 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
19 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
20 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to

1 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, as follows:
3 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
4 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
5 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
6 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
7 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
8 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
9 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
10 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
11 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
12 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
13 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
14 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
15 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
16 investigations; $511,500, and there shall be transferred to
17 the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from
18 Government surplus without compensation therefor, a cer-
19 tain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (con-
20 sisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser Subdivision,
21 and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728 in the city of Pasadena,
22 California), valued at approximately $15,800.
23 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
24 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;

1 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
2 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
3 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
4 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.

5 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re
6 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)
7 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
8 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
9 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
10 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
11 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
12 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

13 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

14 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
15 ing not to exceed ~~$381,700~~ *$305,000* for personal services in
16 the District of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the
17 relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food,
18 clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions
19 of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of
20 such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
21 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
22 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
23 and for disseminating useful information on this subject,
24 ~~$1,045,000~~ *$800,000.*

1 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

2 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
3 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
4 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
5 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
7 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of
8 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
9 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
10 States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service
11 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
12 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
13 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
14 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
15 method development, and for operations conducted under
16 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to,
17 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
18 State and privately owned lands.

19 FOREST SERVICE

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
22 ~~$1,055,378~~ *$1,083,378* for personal services in the District
23 of Columbia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
24 suant to the second sentence of 706 (a) of the Organic Act
25 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the

1 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-
2 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
3 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
4 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
5 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
6 be used for any experiment or test made outside
7 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of
8 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
9 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
10 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
11 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
12 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
13 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
14 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
15 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
16 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
17 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
18 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any
19 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
20 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
21 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
22 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
23 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
24 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
25 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil

1 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
2 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
3 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
4 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
5 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
6 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
7 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National
8 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
9 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
10 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
11 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
12 posters and related printed material, as follows:

13 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
14 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
15 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
16 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
17 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

18 National forest protection and management: For the
19 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
20 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
21 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
22 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
23 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
24 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
25 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to

1 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
2 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
3 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
4 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
5 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
6 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
7 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-
8 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
9 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
10 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
11 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
12 timber cultural operations; development and application
13 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
14 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
15 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
16 appraising of timber and other resources and development
17 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,
18 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
19 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
20 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
21 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
22 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
23 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
24 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
25 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or

1 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
2 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
3 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
4 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
5 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
6 ~~$23,764,891~~ *$24,014,891*, of which not to exceed $25,-
7 000 shall be available for the purchase of one nursery site.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
10 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
12 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
13 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

14 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
15 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
16 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
17 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
18 nance of improvements, as follows:

19 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
20 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
21 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
22 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
23 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
24 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
25 $2,475,000.

1 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
2 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
3 Laboratory, or elsewhere, ~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,250,000*, of
4 which at least $11,050 shall be expended for research in the
5 utilization of waste woods.

6 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
7 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
8 under section 10, ~~$572,000~~ *$822,000*.

9 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

10 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
11 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
12 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
13 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
14 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
15 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
16 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

17 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

18 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
19 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
20 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
21 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
22 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
23 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
24 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
25 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and

1 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
2 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
3 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
4 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
5 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766),
6 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),
7 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
8 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
9 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
10 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
11 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
12 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
13 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
14 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
15 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

16 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

17 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
18 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
19 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), ~~$500,000~~ *$750,000,*
20 ~~to be available only for payment toward the purchase price~~
21 ~~of any lands acquired~~*; the administrative cost of such acqui-*
22 *sition to be met from the appropriation "National Forest*
23 *Protection and Management".*

24 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
25 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-

1 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
2 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
3 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
4 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
5 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
6 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
7 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
8 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;
9 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
10 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
11 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
12 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
13 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
14 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
15 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
16 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National
17 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
18 $35,000; in all $142,000.

19 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

20 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
21 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
22 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
23 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
24 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
25 Service administration, (1) ~~$10,000,000~~ *$11,000,000* for

forest development roads and trails, and (2) ~~$5,300,000~~ *$8,300,000* for forest highways, which sums are authorized to be appropriated by the Act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all, ~~$15,300,000~~ *$19,300,000* (including not to exceed ~~$100,000~~ *$109,530* for personal services in the District of Columbia), to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary.

## FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, $1,500,000 ~~$500,000~~, including personal services in the District of Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain avail-

able until expended, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated~~: *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances.~~

Provided further, that $1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers and their tributaries.

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, including not to exceed ~~$838,500~~ *$875,000* for personal services in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or

1 sanitary system and connecting the same with any such
2 building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings
3 are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for
4 other purposes and except for eight buildings to be con-
5 structed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
6 *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this
7 Act shall be available for the construction of any such
8 building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided*
9 *further,* That in the State of Missouri where the State
10 has established a central State agency authorized to enter
11 into agreements with the United States or any of its
12 agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
13 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
14 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
15 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
16 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
17 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
18 as follows:

19 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
20 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
21 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and
22 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
23 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
24 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
25 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all

1 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
2 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
3 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for con-
4 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental water-
5 sheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, ~~$673,000~~
6 *$1,423,000.*

7 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
8 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
9 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
10 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
11 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation
12 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
13 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
14 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
15 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
16 in demonstration projects.

17 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
18 SUBMARGINAL LAND

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
20 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
21 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions
22 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
23 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

1 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
2 ADMINISTRATION
3 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
4 RESOURCES

5 ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
6 ~~carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 71, inclusive,~~
7 ~~of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-~~
8 ~~proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-~~
9 ~~590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment~~
10 ~~Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except~~
11 ~~the provisions of sections 201, 202, 203, 381, and 383 and~~
12 ~~the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-~~
13 ~~ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for~~
14 ~~the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-~~
15 ~~plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the~~
16 ~~United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until De-~~
17 ~~cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said~~
18 ~~provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as~~
19 ~~amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,~~
20 ~~during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,~~
21 ~~inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000,000 of~~
22 ~~the total sum provided under this head shall be available~~
23 ~~during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-~~
24 ~~ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but~~
25 ~~not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the ap-~~

1 ~~propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,~~
2 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*~~
3 ~~That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the~~
4 ~~certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such~~
5 ~~form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out~~
6 ~~the conservation practice or practices and has complied with~~
7 ~~all other requirements as conditions for such payments and~~
8 ~~that the statements and information contained in the applica-~~
9 ~~tion for payment are correct and true, to the best of his~~
10 ~~knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March~~
11 ~~4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further,*~~
12 ~~That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available~~
13 ~~for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment~~
14 ~~Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of~~
15 ~~February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or~~
16 ~~expenses of any regional information employees or any~~
17 ~~State or county information employees, but this shall not~~
18 ~~preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-~~
19 ~~tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds~~
20 ~~shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses~~
21 ~~in connection with the formulation or administration of any~~
22 ~~1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-~~
23 ~~conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,~~
24 ~~as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment~~
25 ~~Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-~~

1 ~~ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the~~
2 ~~Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer~~
3 ~~to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-~~
4 ~~sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing~~
5 ~~payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such~~
6 ~~amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-~~
7 ~~lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any~~
8 ~~soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-~~
9 ~~cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming~~
10 ~~practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program~~
11 ~~under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*~~
12 ~~*further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make~~
13 ~~payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-~~
14 ~~ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated~~
15 ~~pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-~~
16 ~~tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-~~
17 ~~tary determines that, because of induction into the armed~~
18 ~~forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were~~
19 ~~prevented from filing, applications for payment under any~~
20 ~~such program during the period the applicable appropri-~~
21 ~~ation for such program was available for obligation,~~
22 ~~such payments to be made out of the unobligated~~
23 ~~balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use~~
24 ~~of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of~~
25 ~~Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*~~

1 ~~That an application for payment on the prescribed form is~~
2 ~~filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in~~
3 ~~case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer~~
4 ~~under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the~~
5 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7~~
6 ~~U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the~~
7 ~~date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December~~
8 ~~31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That~~
9 ~~no part of any funds available to the Department, or~~
10 ~~any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting~~
11 ~~a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal~~
12 ~~year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any~~
13 ~~person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled~~
14 ~~"An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved~~
15 ~~August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in~~
16 ~~accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of~~
17 ~~July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or~~
18 ~~attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of~~
19 ~~Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services~~
20 ~~or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a~~
21 ~~Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or~~
22 ~~appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-~~
23 ~~ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*~~
24 ~~*further,* That where farmer participation in the program~~
25 ~~in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full~~

1 ~~amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or~~
2 ~~sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to~~
3 ~~States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have~~
4 ~~not been sufficient to meet such requirements.~~

5 *For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry*
6 *into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the*
7 *Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved*
8 *February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q),*
9 *and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of*
10 *1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the*
11 *provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the*
12 *provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services*
13 *in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the*
14 *preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays*
15 *at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United*
16 *States: $258,000,000, to remain available until December*
17 *31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provi-*
18 *sions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as*
19 *amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,*
20 *pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out*
21 *during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,*
22 *inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the*
23 *total sum provided under this head shall be available during*
24 *the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative*
25 *expenses for carrying out such programs, including the*

1 *peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photo-*
2 *graphs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not*
3 *more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropria-*
4 *tion account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agri-*
5 *cultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That*
6 *payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the*
7 *certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such*
8 *form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried*
9 *out the conservation practice or practices and has complied*
10 *with all other requirements as conditions for such payments*
11 *and that the statements and information contained in the*
12 *application for payment are correct and true, to the best of*
13 *his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of*
14 *March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided*
15 *further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or*
16 *made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural*
17 *Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Num-*
18 *bered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay*
19 *the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees*
20 *or any State or county information employees, but this shall*
21 *not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of*
22 *information to individual farmers: Provided further, That*
23 *such amount shall be available for salaries and other ad-*
24 *ministrative expenses in connection with the formulation and*
25 *administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,-*

1 *000,000, including administration, and formulated on the*
2 *basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments*
3 *and grants among the several States in accordance with*
4 *their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary:*
5 *Provided further, That the proportion* allocated to any ~~*going to a*~~ *State shall*
6 *not be* reduced ~~*changed*~~ *more than 15 per centum from the 1946*
7 *distribution and that no participant shall receive more than*
8 *$500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-con-*
9 *servation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,*
10 *as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjust-*
11 *ment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants*
12 *under such program shall be conditioned upon the utiliza-*
13 *tion of land with respect to which such payments or grants*
14 *are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which*
15 *will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and*
16 *water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective*
17 *manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as*
18 *determined and approved by the State committee appointed*
19 *pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and*
20 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States:*
21 *Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion,*
22 *from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office*
23 *such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-*
24 *penses of said Office in auditing payments under this item:*
25 *Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for*

1 *the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other*
2 *farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and mak-*
3 *ing grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in*
4 *carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary*
5 *in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of*
6 *February 29, 1936, as amended: Provided further, That*
7 *the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments*
8 *to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of*
9 *the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant*
10 *to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and*
11 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary deter-*
12 *mines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the*
13 *United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented*
14 *from filing, applications for payment under any such pro-*
15 *gram during the period the applicable appropriation for*
16 *such program was available for obligation, such payments*
17 *to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropria-*
18 *tion, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources",*
19 *in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946:*
20 *Provided further, That an application for payment on the*
21 *prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person*
22 *entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or in-*
23 *competency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant*
24 *to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,*
25 *as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one*

1 *year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces,*
2 *or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: And provided*
3 *further, That no part of any funds available to the Depart-*
4 *ment, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency*
5 *constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the*
6 *current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel*
7 *expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating*
8 *the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political*
9 *activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who*
10 *has been found in accordance with the provisions of section*
11 *6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have*
12 *violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits*
13 *the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal*
14 *services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner*
15 *a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or*
16 *appropriation by Congress except upon request of any*
17 *Member or through the proper official channels.*

18 SUGAR ACT

19 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
20 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
21 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
22 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of
23 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
24 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)

1 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
2 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

3 ~~NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT~~

4 ~~To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions~~
5 ~~of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public~~
6 ~~Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this~~
7 ~~appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources~~
8 ~~within the States derived from the sale of lunches.~~

9 ~~ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING~~
10 ~~AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS~~

11 ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
12 ~~administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing~~
13 ~~Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d), including~~
14 ~~personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.~~

15 MARKETING SERVICES

16 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed ~~$2,~~
17 ~~211,000~~ *$2,286,000* for personal services in the District of
18 Columbia, in conducting investigations, experiments, and
19 demonstrations, as follows:

20 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
21 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
22 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
23 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
24 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy

1 and poultry products *(including broilers)*, fruits and vege-
2 tables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cotton-
3 seed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, ~~$1,527,500~~
4 *$1,566,250.*

5 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
6 tions and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
7 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
8 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,
9 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
10 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when
11 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
12 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
13 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
14 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
15 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
16 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
17 service rendered, $712,000.

18 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
19 among the people of the United States useful information
20 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
21 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
22 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
23 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
24 ards of classification of American farm and food products
25 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as

1 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
2 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
3 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
4 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
5 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
6 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
7 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
8 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and
9 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
10 diem of persons serving without compensation while away
11 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
12 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
13 ~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,100,000: Provided,* That the Secretary may
14 make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Depart-
15 ment such amounts from this appropriation as may be
16 necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropria-
17 tion is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to
18 amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appro-
19 priation items in this Act.

20 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
21 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
22 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
23 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
24 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection
25 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,

1 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
2 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
3 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
4 $1,552,000.

5 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
6 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
7 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
8 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–
9 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
10 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.
11 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
12 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
13 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
14 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
15 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

16 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
17 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
18 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
19 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
20 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
21 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
22 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
23 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-
24 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
25 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

1 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
2 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
3 $1,128,000.

4 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
5 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

6 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
8 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation
9 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
10 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved
11 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
12 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
13 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
14 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
15 Congress.

16 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
17 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
18 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
19 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

20 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
21 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
22 91–99), $41,000.

23 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
24 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
25 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-

1 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
2 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
3 therein, $293,500.

4 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
5 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
6 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
7 $138,000.

8 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

9 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
10 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity
11 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
12 not to exceed ~~$141,000~~ *$153,000* for personal services
13 in the District of Columbia, $530,000.

14 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

15 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
16 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
17 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
18 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
19 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
20 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
21 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

22 Loans: ~~For loans under~~ *Title I and section 43, $20,-*
23 *000,000;* title II, $60,000,000.

24 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the

1 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
2 $1,000,000.

3 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
4 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
5 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
6 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
7 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
8 ~~$18,000,000~~ *$24,000,000.*

9 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
10 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
11 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-
12 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
13 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
14 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
15 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
16 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
17 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
18 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
19 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
20 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
21 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
22 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-
23 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
24 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security

1 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
3 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
4 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
5 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
6 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
7 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
8 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary
9 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
10 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
11 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
12 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of
13 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
14 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
15 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
16 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
17 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
18 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
19 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
20 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
21 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
22 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
23 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

1 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
2 AREAS

3 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
4 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
5 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
6 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
7 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
8 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

11 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
12 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
13 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

14 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-
15 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
16 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
17 financial and credit reports, ~~$1,000,000~~ *$5,000,000.*

18 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
19 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
20 7 thereof, ~~$225,000,000~~ *$250,000,000*, to be borrowed from
21 the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the pro-
22 visions of section 3 (a) of said Act.

23 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act

1 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
2 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:
3 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
4 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
5 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
6 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
7 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
8 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
9 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
10 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
11 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may
12 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
13 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
14 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
15 Electrification Administration established by Executive
16 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid
17 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
18 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
19 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
20 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
21 foregoing provision: *Provided,* That such obligations in-
22 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
23 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
24 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
25 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity

1 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
2 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of
3 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
4 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
5 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
6 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
7 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
8 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
9 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
10 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
11 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the
12 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
13 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
14 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
15 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
16 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
17 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
18 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
19 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
20 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
21 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
22 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
23 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
24 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
25 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions

1 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
2 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-
3 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
4 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
5 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
6 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
7 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
8 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
9 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
10 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is
11 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
12 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
13 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
14 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
15 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
16 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For
17 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
18 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
19 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
20 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
21 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
22 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
23 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
24 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
25 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

1 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
2 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall
3 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
4 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
5 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
6 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
7 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
8 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

9 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses including personal services in
12 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
13 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
14 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
15 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
16 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-
17 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
18 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
19 lower price than to others, payment for which may
20 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
21 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
22 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
23 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
24 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
25 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per

1 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
2 from their homes, without other compensation from the
3 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
4 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
5 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
6 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
7 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
8 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act
9 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
10 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
11 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
12 organizations as provided in said section.

13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
15 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
16 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,
17 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
18 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
19 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
20 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
21 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
22 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
23 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
24 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
25 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary

1 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
2 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-
3 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
4 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
5 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
6 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
7 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
8 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal
9 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
10 association serving the area.

11 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
12 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
13 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
14 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
15 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
16 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-
17 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
18 Department for which appropriations are made under such
19 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
20 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
21 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
22 Budget.

23 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
24 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
25 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-

1 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
2 gency of persons in the field service of the Department
3 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
4 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
5 tural Relations.

6 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
7 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
8 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

9 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
10 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
11 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
12 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
13 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
14 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

15 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
16 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
17 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
18 the United States or who is a member of an organization
19 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
20 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
21 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
22 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
23 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
24 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
25 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the

1 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
2 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
3 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
4 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
5 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
6 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
7 Government of the United States by force or violence:
8 *Provided further,* That such administrative or supervisory
9 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
10 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
11 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
12 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
13 *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a
14 strike against the Government of the United States or who
15 is a member of an organization of Government employees
16 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of
17 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
18 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
19 Government of the United States by force or violence
20 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
21 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
22 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
23 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
24 more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the
25 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in

1 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
2 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be con-
3 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
4 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
5 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
6 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
7 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
8 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
9 templated by this section.

10 *Sec. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for*
11 *personal services under appropriations in this Act shall*
12 *not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act*
13 *of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).*

14 Sec. ~~8~~ *9.* This Act may be cited as the "Department of
15 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

16 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

17 Sec. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
18 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
19 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
20 year, namely:

21 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
22 expenses, ~~$1,000,000~~ *$5,000,000,* including not to exceed
23 $700 for newspapers.

24 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
25 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to

1 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop
2 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
3 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
4 $10,000,000.

5 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
6 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
7 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
8 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
9 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
10 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation
11 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
12 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
13 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

14 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
15 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
16 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
17 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
18 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
19 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
20 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for
21 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
22 (including legal and special services performed on a contract
23 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
24 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
25 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property

1 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
2 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
3 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
4 hereof.

5 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
6 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
7 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
8 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
9 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of
10 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
11 cotton, and flax: *Provided further, That none of the funds*
12 *herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or*
13 *subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred*
14 *and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-*
15 *seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of*
16 *the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five*
17 *additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508*
18 *(a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and to-*
19 *bacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not*
20 *to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legis-*
21 *lation.*.

22 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
23 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-
24 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
25 plicable to title II of this Act.

1 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

2 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF

3 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

4 Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Pub-
5 lic Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved
6 August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition
7 612 (c)), not more than ~~$40,000,000~~ *$48,000,000* shall
8 be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
9 for use in effectuating the purposes of that Act. *To enable*
10 *the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National*
11 *School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396),*
12 *there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds*
13 *appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the*
14 *Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)),*
15 *such amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limi-*
16 *tation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of*
17 *funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of sec-*
18 *tion 9 of the National School Lunch Act.* The remainder of
19 the fund appropriated by said Act for the fiscal year 1948
20 is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be
21 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury
22 immediately thereafter.

Passed the House of Representatives May 28, 1947.

Attest: JOHN ANDREWS,

*Clerk.*

[SUBCOMMITTEE PRINT]

Calendar No.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. ]

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY , 1947

Reported with amendments

Calendar No. 493

80TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 474

# AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3601]

The Committee on Appropriations to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount of bill as passed House | [1] $572, 172, 266 |
| Amount of increase by Senate committee (net) | 92, 664, 160 |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate | 664, 836, 426 |
| Amount of appropriations, 1947 | 643, 154, 411 |
| Amount of estimates for 1948 | 805, 141, 608 |
| The bill as reported to the Senate: | |
| Under the estimates for 1948 | 140, 305, 182 |
| Exceeds the appropriations for 1947 | 21, 682, 015 |

[1] Includes estimated assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system of $2,781,000.

The committee recommends a total for direct appropriations in the bill of $663,736,426, which is $91,564,160 more than the amount of the direct appropriations in the bill as it passed the House.

The following table shows, in addition to direct appropriations, the permanent appropriations and loan authorizations available to the Department for 1948:

*Summary of appropriations and loan authorizations in House and Senate bills, 1948, compared with 1947, and budget estimates, 1948*

| Item | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), House bill compared with— | | Senate bill, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Direct appropriations in agricultural appropriation bill | $643, 154, 411 | $805, 141, 608 | $572, 172. 266 | −$70, 982, 145 | −$232,969,342 | $664, 836, 426 | +$21, 682, 015 | −$140,305,182 | +$92, 764, 160 |
| Permanent appropriations | 127, 747, 348 | 158, 429, 710 | 50, 429, 710 | −77, 317, 638 | −108,000,000 | 13[illegible], 429, 710 | +5, 682, 362 | −25,000,000 | +83, 000, 000 |
| Total, direct appropriations | 770, 901, 759 | 963, 571, 318 | 622, 601, 976 | −148, 299, 783 | −340,969,342 | 798, 266, 136 | +27, 364, 377 | −165,305,182 | +175, 664, 160 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | ---------- | ---------- | −133, 784, 292 | ---------- | ---------- | −133, 784, 292 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Borrowings authorized: | | | | | | | | | |
| From RFC | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | ---------- | −370, 000, 000 | −225,000,000 | ---------- | −370, 000, 000 | −225,000,000 | ---------- |
| From Secretary of the Treasury | ---------- | ---------- | 225, 000. 000 | +225, 000, 000 | +225,000,000 | 250, 000, 000 | +250, 000, 000 | +250,000,000 | +25, 000, 000 |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations to borrow from RFC and Secretary of the Treasury | 1, 274, 686, 051 | 1, 188, 571, 318 | 847, 601, 976 | −427, 084, 075 | −340,969,342 | 1, 048, 266, 136 | −226, 419, 915 | −140,305,182 | +200, 664, 160 |

As a result of 3 weeks of hearings held by the subcommittee which supplement the published hearings of the House, the committee submits the following comments pertaining to committee recommendations on the budget estimates and House bill:

## OFFICE OF SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The essential activities of the Department of Agriculture are reduced compared with the war period. Also, a reduction in various action programs is contemplated in the Senate bill, which follows, in part, the provisions of House bill 3601, pertaining to the agricultural appropriation bill. The recommended appropriation to the Office of the Secretary represents a large increase above that of the war years. The committee, therefore, supports the House in reducing the budget of $2,150,000 by the amount of $100,000, believing that necessary adjustments in administration can be made to conform to this action.

## PENALTY MAIL

An increase of 23 percent in the penalty-mail rate will more than offset the effect of any reduction of activities in the Department of Agriculture in the use of mail facilities. The committee, therefore, increases the House bill to $3,486,000 for penalty mail. While this is an increase of $300,000, the mail-rate increase would amount to $750,000 on the volume of mail issued by the Department in the past year. The Department of Agriculture, it is understood, is prepared to absorb a part of the increased rates by a reduction in volume of penalty mail.

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The committee recommends the appropriation of the sum of $9,500,000 for the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This amount represents the first year's increment authorized in the act, and it is further recommended that the distribution of this fund to the various purposes designated in the act shall be in the proportions indicated in the act. While the amount is $500,000 above that contained in the House bill and the distribution of the fund differs, it is believed that the committee action may conform to the intent of the House floor action.

While not convinced that satisfactory plans have been fully developed for the administration of research contemplated in the act to be used by the Department of Agriculture, the committee felt it unwise to change the distribution of the funds from the plans outlined in the act. While some of the State agricultural experiment stations may be in a position to proceed more rapidly with research contemplated under the act, others would lack the scientific personnel required to initiate the new research. A large fund made available immediately might create an undesirable competition in recruiting the required personnel; hence it is believed wise to permit the program to expand no more rapidly than contemplated when the act was enacted into law.

The committee considers that there is good reason for the Department of Agriculture to consider setting up a division apart from all

action and regulatory activities for the administration of the research contemplated under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The budget request of $2,525,000 for the Office of the Solicitor is reduced by $300,000. This is $200,000 above the amount carried in the House bill, as it was felt this amount was justified on the basis of past experience. The basis for this action is the reduced activity of the Department of Agriculture in work requiring the assistance of the Solicitor's Office and, furthermore, to encourage no more routine supervision of the Solicitor's Office than is essential to the work of the Department. Certain activities, such as rural-electrification cooperatives, need to be encouraged to accept as much responsibility for their own activities as they are capable of assuming and as procedures in such work as the Market Agreements Act become standardized, less routine attention on the part of the Solicitor's Office should expedite the work in the interest of all concerned.

### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee follows the recommendation of the House in reducing the budget for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Information by providing for an appropriation of $575,000, which is a decrease of $125,000 below the budget estimate. The committee agrees with the House committee that publicity activities of the Department can well be reduced in the interest of economy and more wholesome public relations.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The committee recommends a reduction of $250,000 to be applied to the economic investigations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, thus replacing $500,000 of the reduction made in the House bill which was regarded as too severe a reduction following a heavy cut in appropriations to this Bureau a year ago. The committee considers the work in crop and livestock estimates to be the most efficient organization of its kind and wishes to lend it full encouragement. It is believed, however, that the economic investigations can be reduced without impairing the Bureau's essential activities in assembling and interpreting economic information, or its cooperative relationships with the various States. These two interests, in particular, the committee feels, should be adequately financed to insure their efficiency in marshaling economic information essential to building sound economic programs for agriculture. It does not appeal to the committee, in line with the interest of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, that that fund should be used for new research, to expect that fund to carry the lines of work specifically mentioned above.

### OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The committee sustains the action of the House in reducing the budget estimate for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations from $728,000 to $428,000. The committee considers that the work of this Office has been handicapped by its close association with the Depart-

ment of State. On the other hand, it recognizes that it has an important function to perform in connection with the development of international trade relationships in agricultural products and markets for agricultural products, and therefore urges that careful direction be given to work in this field. In supporting the reduction imposed by the House, the committee does not wish to impair the essential duties of this Office from now until such time as the Office may become more efficiently organized in its relation to the State Department.

### AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

The need of appropriating the last authorized increment of the Bankhead-Jones agricultural extension fund of $4,000,000 was urgently presented to the committee by the State directors of the Agricultural Extension Service. Although authorized to be appropriated this year, the item was not included in the budget presented to Congress. Recognizing the benefits growing out of the Extension Service and the desirability of further support for the 4–H Clubs and other work with farm youth in particular, the committee would call attention to the reductions recommended for other agencies working with farm people and they are giving their approval to the Extension Service by not reducing funds appropriated for this purpose.

### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

In the over-all view of the significance of research and the appropriation of funds authorized under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, some relatively small reductions in research are not in reality a reduction, since the added research funds will be available for new studies in these fields.

### SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND

The committee sustains the House reduction of $100,000 in the budget estimate of $1,303,000 in the special research fund. The Agricultural Research Administration will have added support from the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and should be able to absorb this small reduction in funds without impairing its work, especially since the Research and Marketing Act funds should be available to promote new lines of promising research.

### ALASKA EXPERIMENT STATION

The committee, after careful review of the House hearings and testimony presented to the Senate of representatives from Alaska and the Department of Agriculture, recommends that research funds derived from appropriations for State agricultural research normally administered by the Office of Experiment Stations be appropriated to the Territory of Alaska on the basis outlined in the budget, except for the additional $100,000 included in the House bill. The fund of $100,000 recommended by the committee is designated to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Alaska Experiment Station. The total fund made available for work in Alaska remains unchanged. The committee reached this decision on the basis that there was no apparent reason for the regular agricultural research work in Alaska to be administered differently from that of the several States and Territories.

### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY INSPECTION AND QUARANTINE

The amount of $1,225,197 contained in the House bill for animal inspection and quarantine is a larger amount than has been made available in any year prior to 1947. The committee feels that House action in reducing the budget item by $114,803 is sound.

### MEAT INSPECTION

The committee believes that the system of Federal meat inspection has contributed to the health of the public through eliminating seriously diseased animals from 75 percent of the publicly slaughtered meat animals. If the cost of inspection were shifted to the packers, it is believed that many small packers would forego inspection and limit their trade to intrastate channels. Therefore, in the best interest of the public, the committee sustains the budget estimate, appropriating $11,140,000 for meat inspection as opposed to the House bill plan to place Federal meat inspection on a fee basis to be paid by the packers.

### VIRUS SERUM TOXIN ACT

The testimony presented pertaining to virus serum toxin inspection and regulation indicated that this work is vitally associated with the animal industry of the Nation and the need for its support was strongly urged by the foremost serum and virus producers. The committee, therefore, decided that full support of the budget item in the amount of $340,000 was justified, thus restoring the cut imposed by the House.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

The committee is in accord with the House bill in reducing the budget estimate for the Bureau of Dairy Industry by $125,000 to the amount of $1,011,000, which represents a material increase over any preceding year except 1947. It was recognized that livestock-breeding experimentation might easily be permitted to expand unless kept under control.

### FOREST DISEASES

The committee restored $20,000 of the budget reduction imposed by the House bill to be applied, in particular, to the work with chestnut diseases, which leaves an amount of $379,280 for forest diseases. This exceeds the appropriation of previous years for forest diseases, and the committee would permit the Bureau to distribute the total appropriation for forest diseases in accordance with its judgment.

### SOILS, FERTILIZERS, AND IRRIGATION

The committee restored $100,000 to the budget for soils, fertilizers, and irrigation. This represents an appropriation of $1,491,000, or $100,000 in excess of the House bill. While the Bureau should distribute the total appropriation in the best interest of agriculture, the committee felt that the various irrigation and dry-land experiment stations proposed for closing under the conditions of the House bill should be maintained until the respective States are given adequate opportunity to provide funds for their operation. At least part of these stations have permanent values to the States concerned and they should have the opportunity of providing support for them and to accept the responsibility for them.

### NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Funds for the National Arboretum were approved in the amount of $436,900 in accordance with the House recommendation. This affords the necessary funds for acquiring additional land and to continue development work, but delays the construction of buildings, roads, and other improvements until such construction can be accomplished with more ample supplies of materials and labor at less cost.

### SPECIAL DISEASE STUDIES

The committee felt that the requests for work on the control of the sclerotina disease on beans in Florida and diseases of mushrooms could receive attention from the appropriations to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering.

### INSECT INVESTIGATIONS

The committee concurs with the House action in reducing the budget estimate for insect investigations $188,700 which gives the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine the sum of $2,961,300 or a total amount of money in excess of the total appropriation for 1947. While some reduction in research may be necessary, it should not eliminate any essential activity and represents a measure of economy. It is understood that adjustments can be made which will make it possible to retain work on insect identification and classification, and to retain the major part of the investigations of insects affecting men and animals, and general control investigations.

### INSECT AND PLANT-DISEASE CONTROL

Recognizing in particular the menace of the pink boll worm along the Mexican border, the committee recommends that $250,000 be restored in the cut contained in the House bill. This would provide a budget of $2,947,100, which exceeds any previous appropriations except that of 1947. The control of the Dutch elm disease apparently has not proven effective and experimental and research work on this disease rather than control operations need to be emphasized. The need of resurveying areas that have been covered in barberry eradication work in recent years was recognized as a need which might require effective action and an increased appropriation in the appropriation bill of next year.

With the increase recommended by the committee of $100,000, there is now a total of $151,000 in the bill for continuation of work on the Dutch-elm disease, with special emphasis recommended to be given to vigorous research efforts on this disease.

### CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

The committee supports the action of the House in reducing the budget item of $2,800,000 to $2,050,000 for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases since the Bureau proposes the early termination of control work on the pear Psylla and since serious outbreaks may be taken care of from deficiency appropriations.

### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $305,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia and a total of $800,000 for

the work of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which is a reduction of $245,000 below the budget estimate and the House bill. The work of the Bureau was greatly expanded during the war and the recommended appropriation greatly exceeds that of any preceding year.

### WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

The House reduction of $250,000 below the Budget estimates has been accepted. The committee, however, proposes that the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine distribute this reduction between the projects carried on under its direction rather than to apply it to the single project for leadership, coordination, and technical direction as indicated in the report of the House committee.

### FOREST SERVICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee supports the House action in reducing the budget by $32,000, which represents a small reduction.

### NATIONAL FOREST PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $24,014,891 is approved for national forest protection and management which is $250,000 above the House recommendation. This increased amount is designated for unit-management work which it is felt needs emphasis because of some lack of attention during the war. And, also, to develop the Lake Tahoe recreational area.

### FOREST AND RANGE MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATIONS

The committee sustains the House reduction of $200,000 from the budget estimate of $2,675,000 for forest and range management investigations, which leaves a larger appropriation for this purpose than in any prior year except 1947.

### FOREST PRODUCTS INVESTIGATIONS

The committee restored $250,000 of the $555,000 reduction recommended by the House. This was done to speed up research pertaining to the utilization of waste material in the lumber industry, recognizing that the actual waste exceeds in amount the proportion of the tree that is made into lumber.

### FOREST RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS

The House recommendation of $572,000 was increased to $822,000, which is still $250,000 below the budget. Many States are ready to cooperate with the Forest Service in conducting surveys or appraisals of their forest resources. The committee believes the recommended appropriation will expedite this work.

### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $750,000 for the acquisition of forest land, or an increase of $250,000 above the House recommendation, with the provision that the administrative cost of such acquisition is to be met from the appropriation for "National forest protection and management."

### FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The committee recommends an increase over the House bill from $10,000,000 to $11,000,000 for forest road development and from $5,300,000 to $8,300,000 for forest highways, or a total of $19,300,000, as compared to the budget figure of $23,800,000. The committee is aware of improvements needed in badly worn roads as well as new road construction, but feels with the existing high costs of construction that the recommendations are generous.

### FLOOD CONTROL

The committee recommends the appropriation of $1,000,000 for the express purpose of making preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. This action is designed because of the disastrous floods which have occurred in this region.

### SOIL-CONSERVATION RESEARCH

The committee has restored the budget estimate for soil-conservation research by returning $750,000 removed in the House bill. The committee feels strongly that more research is urgently needed as a basis for developing sound soil-conservation action in the field. Furthermore, the various State agricultural experiment stations have felt this need so keenly that a number are more than matching the Federal funds for new research pertaining to soil conservation.

### SOIL-CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

The committee sustains the House action in approving $38,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, which is a reduction of $5,437,000 from the budget estimate. This action is taken because the committee feels that the Service has expanded rapidly and that much remains to be gained in effective field operation. The apparent duplication of services to farmers should be correlated into a more unified plan of action in the field on a basis that will give due consideration to all aspects of a progressive agriculture developed in the interest of all of society.

### LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

The committee supports the House bill of $1,600,000 for Land Utilization and Retirement of Submarginal Land compared to the budget estimate of $3,260,000, believing that these provisions will care for critical needs and that some of the work proposed under this item should await more favorable construction conditions.

### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The committee takes exception to the House bill provisions for the agricultural program. The committee recognizes the obligation resting upon Congress by virtue of the authorization by Congress last year of an agricultural "Conservation and use of agricultural resources" program for 1947 and provides for carrying out that program by appropriating the amount of $258,000,000. This amount, together with the surplus of approximately $37,000,000 carried over from the 1946 program, will provide $267,620,754 estimated to be

needed to make the payments to farmers authorized a year ago and leave approximately $27,500,000 for the administration of the program. While this procedure does not provide a carry-over fund to initiate the 1948 program, the Department of Agriculture has a standing authorization to borrow $50,000,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation to assist in carrying the program until the succeeding appropriation becomes available.

The committee further recognizes that Congress is considering the development of a future agricultural program, but believes that until such time as a new program is developed there should be a continuing program similar to the one now in operation. To that end the committee recommends the authorization of an agricultural program for 1948 in the amount of $150,000,000 to cover the payments to farmers and the administration of the program. The authorization is offered in recognition of the desirability of continuing to focus attention upon the importance of soil conservation and to supplement the educational and demonstrational work in this field. During this period of high farm prices, the committee feels that the farmer can afford to contribute a larger proportion of the cost of soil-conserving practices during 1948 but that the work should continue to receive encouragement and that the organization to conduct the program should be maintained. Also there are other essential duties including crop insurance, and surplus commodity removal operations, to be performed at the county level. The committee believes its action will effect economies in administration without serious detriment to the desired objectives.

### NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH ACTIVITIES

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $75,000,000 for school-lunch activities which is $30,000,000 above the House bill and directs that $75,000,000 be used from section 32 funds for this purpose. It is also recommended that funds derived from the sale of lunches to children may be used as matching funds for Federal appropriations for the ensuing year. This action is deemed advisable because few State legislatures are still in session so that they can take action in matching Federal funds with State appropriations. The committee wishes to put itself on record, however, urging that State appropriations be made to match Federal funds in the proportions set forth in the National School Lunch Act.

### MARKETING FARM PRODUCTS

The committee increases the House bill appropriation of $1,000,000 to $1,100,000 for marketing farm products. This increase is intended to expedite the transportation of farm products particularly with reference to continuing the surveys of shipping and storage space requirements to handle farm products. Information available to the committee indicates that this service has been useful and should be continued.

### UNITED STATES WAREHOUSE ACT

The committee sustains the House action in reducing the budget item of $685,000 for the administration of the United States Warehouse Act to $585,000, which it considers to be adequate.

### COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

The committee sustains the House bill in reducing the budget estimate of $650,000 for the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act to $530,000, believing this amount is sufficient for the administration of this act.

### FARM TENANT LOANS

The committee restores the fund for farm tenant loans to $20,000,000 which had been eliminated by the House, although the budget requests was for $35,000,000. The committee, further, requests that priority be given to veterans who apply for loans but admonishes the Farmers Home Administration to avoid loaning on values which seem likely to lead to the financial disaster of the borrowers. Land prices have risen over 100 percent in the past 10 years in many States and represent heavy inflation compared to prewar years in many areas. It must be recognized that the reported good record of tenant farm purchase activities has been due to the deflated land prices of 15 years ago, and a continually rising price level for farm products over many years and abnormal prices during the war years. Therefore, it would seem a matter of prudence for the Administration to be less active in farm loan activities in many areas and to be continually on guard against excessive prices that are likely to bring disaster to borrowers who have little capital, and discredit to the program itself.

### PRODUCTION AND SUBSISTENCE LOANS

The committee concurs with the House bill in reducing the budget estimate of $90,000,000 to $60,000,000 for production and subsistence loans by the Farmers Home Administration. With the period of good production and prices for agricultural products an increasing number of the clients of the Farmers Home Administration should become eligible for loans from other sources especially when loan funds are plentiful in the hands of private lenders.

### INSURED MORTGAGES

The committee concurs with the House in limiting the fund for insured mortgages to $1,000,000 since the testimony by officials of the Farmers Home Administration indicated that there had been no interest in loans insured on the basis specified in the act.

### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee restored $6,000,000 of the $12,000,000 House reduction from the budget estimates of $30,000,000. With the volume of loans outstanding and with the understanding that special effort will be given to clearing long standing feed, seed, and drouth loans, in particular, there seems to be justification for the recommendation of the committee.

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $250,000,000 for loan funds to rural electrification cooperatives, with the provision that the full amount shall be borrowed directly from the Secretary of

the Treasury. This procedure will enable saving three-fourths of 1 percent formerly paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which will increase the payments from the cooperatives to the Treasury by approximately $4,280,000 annually on loans now outstanding. The fact that 15 percent of the loan funds to the Rural Electrification Cooperatives have been direct appropriations has placed the loans now made to the cooperatives in a strong collateral position, justifying this change in procedure.

The committee instructs the Administrator of REA to report to both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees in writing 30 days in advance of approving allocations of funds for acquiring or building generating plants.

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee reduced the budget estimate of $5,600,000 to $5,000,000 or $1,000,000 in excess of the House bill. The volume of work of this administration is near a peak which justifies strong support, but the committee believes there has been undue extravagance in salaries considering the experience and training of personnel. The committee, therefore, admonishes the administration to make the major economy in the budget by down-grading or eliminating the high-salaried positions rather than to eliminate employees in the lower grades of salaries.

### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee recommends $5,000,000 in place of the budget estimate of $9,330,000 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. There is pending legislation in each House providing for new crop insurance programs, which will probably replace the experimental program proposed by the Department of Agriculture. The fact that there are 540,000 crop insurance contracts outstanding makes it imperative that funds be made available for continued administration of the program. The recommendation of the committee is considered adequate to meet the needs of the administration of the existing act and to continue an experimental program.

### SECTION 32 FUNDS

The committee sustains the budget estimate of $48,000,000 for the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, which is an increase of $8,000,000 above the House action. This increase will make it unnecessary to make a direct appropriation for the administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, for which the House bill provided $525,500. The administrative expenses for the act would under this proposal be made available from a 4 percent allowance for administration from the amount of section 32 funds appropriated to the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities.

### INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

## Title I—General appropriations

Penalty mail ..... $300,000

Research and Marketing Act of 1946:

For research on utilization and associated problems ..... 500,000

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products ..... 500,000

The committee recommends a readjustment of the amounts provided in the House bill so as to bring them into conformity with the authorization set forth in the act. An increase is recommended of $500,000 in all for a total of $9,500,000, distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| For payments to States (a reduction of $500,000) | $2,500,000 |
| For research on utilization (an increase of $500,000) | 3,000,000 |
| For cooperative research (to remain the same amount) | 1,500,000 |
| For improvement and development of distribution and marketing system (an increase of $500,000) | 2,500,000 |
| | 9,500,000 |

The amount recommended in all is half of the authorization and estimate of $19,000,000.

The committee also recommends that the following provision be deleted:

of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching requirement;

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

: *Provided, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said Act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out "authorized to be appropriated under section 9 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a)"*

Office of the Solicitor ..... 200,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for necessary expenses.

The committee also recommends a decrease in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $97,000, for a total of $1,500,000.

Printing and binding:

The committee recommends that the following proviso be stricken from the bill:

"for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection therewith",

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

*to carry into effect the terms of section 23 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32.*

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation on the amount to be transferred of $74,700, to provide for a total of $170,000.

## Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Economic investigations ..... $500,000

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $500,000, for a total of $2,387,000 for the limitation.

## Agricultural Research Administration:

Bureau of Animal Industry:

Meat inspection ..... 6,140,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide the estimate of $11,140,000.

The committee recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be

## Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

included in the budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

Virus Serum Toxin Act ..... $50,000

The committee recommends the increase to provide the full amount of the estimate for carrying out the provisions of the act of $340,000.

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau of $2,840, for a total of $1,061,840 for the limitation.

Total, Bureau of Animal Industry ..... 6,190,000

## Bureau of Dairy Industry:

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $40,912, to provide a total of $540,912 for the limitation.

## Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:

Forest diseases ..... 20,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for investigations and research on chestnut diseases, including breeding, testing, and propagating blight-resistant hybrids.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation ..... 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to be allocated by the Department.

Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, etc ..... 120,000

## Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:

Insect and plant disease control ..... 350,000

Of the increase recommended by the committee, $250,000 is for work on control and prevention of spread of the pink bollworm of cotton, and $100,000 is for work on Dutch-elm disease, with special emphasis on research.

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $17,440, to provide a total of $709,440 for the limitation.

Total, Agricultural Research Administration ..... 6,660,000

## Forest Service:

National forest protection and management ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for general management, operation, and regulation of national forest properties, of which $25,000 is to provide funds for construction of necessary sanitary and other recreational facilities on the Lake Tahoe recreation area.

Forest products ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for experiments, investigations, and tests to be allocated by the Department.

## Forest Service—Continued

Forest resources investigations ..... $250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for survey and investigations, to be allocated by the Department.

The committee also recommends an increase of $28,000 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia, to provide a total of $1,083,378 for the limitation.

Acquisition of lands for national forests ..... 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for the acquisition of forest land under the Weeks Act.

The committee further recommends that the following be stricken from the bill:

to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired.

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

*; the administrative cost of such acquisition to be met from the appropriation "National forest protection and management"*

Total, Forest Service ..... 1,000,000

## Forest Roads and Trails:

Forest development roads and trails ..... 1,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails in the national forests, to provide a total of $11,000,000, which is $1,500,000 below the estimate of $12,500,000.

Forest highways ..... 3,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for carrying out the provisions of sec. 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to provide a total of $8,300,000, which is $3,000,000 below the estimate of $11,300,000.

The committee also recommends an increase of $9,530 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia, to provide a total of $109,530 for the limitation.

Total, Forest roads and trails ..... 4,000,000

## Flood Control ..... 1,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to cover the following proviso, which is also recommended to be added to the bill:

*: Provided further, That $1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.*

## Soil Conservation Service:

Soil conservation research ..... 750,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for research and investigations, to provide the budget estimate of $1,423,000.

The committee also recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $36,500, to provide a total of $875,000 for the limitation.

## Production and Marketing Administration:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources..... $92,385,710

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be deleted from the bill:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation or administration of any 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to marketing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming

Production and Marketing Administration—Con.

practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That where farmer participation in the program in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

and that the following paragraph be inserted in lieu thereof:

*For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of*

Production and Marketing Administration—Con.

*the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,109,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary pay prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, provided that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: Providing further, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural*

## Production and Marketing Administration—Continued

*conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: Provided further, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: Provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.*

### Marketing Services:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Market news service | | $38,750 |
| The increase recommended by the committee is for the following: | | |
| To provide for market news service on wholesale dressed meat on the west coast, at Los Angeles and at Portland | $25,000 | |
| To provide for market news service on cheese and related products in Wisconsin | 13,750 | |
| Total | 38,750 | |

The committee also recommends, after the words "dairy and poultry products", the addition of the following:

(*including broilers*)

| | |
|---|---|
| Marketing farm products | 100,000 |

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $1,100,000 for carrying out the program, which is $300,000 below the estimate of $1,400,000.

The committee also recommends an increase of $75,000 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia for Marketing Services, for a total of $2,286,000 for the limitation.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total, Marketing Services | 138,750 |

## Commodity Exchange Authority:

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $12,000, to provide a total of $153,000 for the limitation.

## Farmers Home Administration:

Farm tenant loans ..... $20,000,000

The committee recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

For loans under

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

*Title I and section 43, $20,000,000*

In recommending this increase, the committee is of the opinion that first priority should be given to applications from veterans.

Salaries and expenses ..... 6,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses of the Administration.

Total, Farmers Home Administration ..... 26,000,000

## Rural Electrification Administration:

Salaries and expenses ..... 1,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, with the admonishment to the Administration that economies should be effected by reducing the higher-grade employees rather than the lower-grade employees.

Loans:

The committee recommends that the authorization to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury be increased from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000.

## General provisions:

Terminal-leave payments.

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill:

*Sec. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).*

## Title II—Government corporations

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation ..... 4,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for operating expenses, to provide a total of $5,000,000.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be added to the bill:

*: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-seven counties, in accordance with Section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of Section 508 (a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation.*

## Title III—Reduction in appropriation

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities:

The committee recommends an increase of $8,000,000 in the limitation on the amount of funds to be available during 1948 for use in effectuating the purposes of the 1935 act, to provide a total of $48,000,000 of available sec. 32 funds.

Total increases ..... $138,934,460

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Research and Marketing Act of 1946:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations ..... 500,000

The committee recommends a decrease in this program in order to readjust the amount in conformity with the authorization in the Act, as explained under the items for increases, to provide a total of $2,500,000.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska:

The committee recommends that the following paragraphs be deleted from the bill:

To enable the Secretary, through such officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Territory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and with other public and private agencies. The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities hereunder. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than any land in general use heretofore for other university purposes, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable continue the employment of the existing personnel of the station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended balances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature or acquired under authority of law for the construction, use, and development of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, the availability of such

## Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

funds to be unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the transfer.

### Office of Experiment Stations

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

and that the following paragraphs be inserted in lieu thereof:

#### *Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska*

*To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings*

## Agricultural Research Administration—Continued

*and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.*

### *Office of Experiment Stations*

#### *PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO*

*For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:*

*Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7. U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,663,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.*

#### *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

*Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.*

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics ..... $245,000

The reduction recommended by the committee is in the necessary expenses for conducting the program.

The committee also recommends a reduction in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $76,700, for a total of $305,000 for the limitation.

Flood control:

The committee recommends that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

*Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior-year balances.

National School Lunch Act ..... $45,000,000

The committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

and that the following be inserted under title III on sec. 32 funds:

*To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c) ), such amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act.*

Administration of agricultural marketing agreements and orders ..... 525,300

The committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total decreases | 46,270,300 |
| Total increase | 138,934,460 |
| Total decrease | 46,270,300 |
| Net increase | 91,564,160 |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate | 664,836,426 |

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED FOR 1947, THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1948, AND THE AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE ACCOMPANYING BILL FOR 1948

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

### TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 [1] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Office of the Secretary (salaries and expenses): | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *$87,560* | *$87,560* | *$7,560* | *$87,560* | | | |
| Direct appropriation | [2] 2,031,650 | 2,150,000 | 2,050,000 | 2,050,000 | +$18,350 | −$100,000 | |
| *Total* | *2,119,210* | *2,237,560* | *2,137,560* | *2,137,560* | +18,350 | −100,000 | |
| Penalty mail (sec. 2, Public Law 364, 78th Cong.) | 3,186,000 | 3,686,000 | 3,186,000 | 3,486,000 | +300,000 | −200,000 | +$300,000 |
| Research and Marketing Act of 1946 | | 19,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,500,000 | +9,500,000 | −9,500,000 | +500,000 |
| Office of Solicitor (salaries and expenses): | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *136,000* | *136,000* | *136,000* | *136,000* | | | |
| Direct appropriation | 2,479,000 | 2,525,000 | 2,025,000 | 2,225,000 | −254,000 | −300,000 | +200,000 |
| *Total* | *2,615,000* | *2,661,000* | *2,161,000* | *2,361,000* | *−254,000* | *−300,000* | *+200,000* |
| Office of Information: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *13,710* | *13,975* | *13,975* | *13,975* | +265 | | |
| Direct appropriation | [3] 661,050 | 700,000 | 575,000 | 575,000 | −86,050 | −125,000 | |
| *Total* | *674,760* | *713,975* | *588,975* | *588,975* | *−85,785* | *+125,000* | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Printing and binding: | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *185,000* | *170,000* | *95,300* | 170,000 | −15,000 | | *+74,700* |
| Direct appropriation | 1,310,600 | 1,607,000 | 1,607,000 | 1,607,000 | +296,400 | | |
| *Total* | *1,495,600* | *1,777,000* | *1,702,300* | *1,777,000* | *+281,400* | | *+74,700* |
| *Total, Office of Information* | *2,170,360* | *2,490,975* | *2,291,275* | *2,365,975* | *+195,615* | *−125,000* | *+74,700* |
| Library (salaries and expenses): | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *850* | | | | −850 | | |
| Direct appropriation | 618,000 | 660,000 | 660,000 | 660,000 | +42,000 | | |
| *Total* | *618,850* | *660,000* | *660,000* | *660,000* | *+41,150* | | |
| Bureau of Agricultural Economics: | | | | | | | |
| Economic investigations: | | | | | | | |
| *Transfers* | *80,150* | | | | −80,150 | | |
| Direct appropriation | 2,413,457 | 2,493,600 | 1,743,600 | 2,243,600 | −169,857 | −250,000 | +500,000 |
| *Total* | *2,493,607* | *2,493,600* | *1,743,600* | *2,243,600* | *−250,007* | *−250,000* | *+500,000* |
| Crop and livestock estimates (direct appropriation) | [4] 2,375,450 | 2,375,400 | 2,375,400 | 2,375,400 | −50 | | |
| *Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics* | *4,869,057* | *4,869,000* | *4,119,000* | *4,619,000* | *−250,057* | *−250,000* | *+500,000* |
| Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (salaries and expenses) | 728,000 | 728,000 | 428,000 | 428,000 | −300,000 | −300,000 | |
| International Production Control Committees [5] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [12,500] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

[1] Individual amounts in this column include provision for additional funds to meet costs arising from the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390), by transfer from other appropriations currently available pursuant to authorization in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[2] For comparability with the Budget estimate, excludes a total of $16,850 proposed for transfer in 1948, as follows: $12,550 to "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information" (for accounting and fiscal functions), and $4,300 to "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service" (for accounting and fiscal functions). Committee approves.

[3] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $12,550 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.

[4] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $3,450 propose transfer in 1948 from the appropriation "Naval stores investigations," Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry (for naval stores statistics work). Committee approves.

[5] Authorization to transfer funds for this purpose from the appropriation made by sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 ($8,500) and from the appropriation for the Sugar Act ($4,000).

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 [1] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Extension Service: | | | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | | | |
| Capper-Ketcham Act | $1,480,000 | $1,480,000 | $1,480,000 | $1,480,000 | | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act, title II: | | | | | | | |
| Sec. 21 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 | | | |
| Sec. 23 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 8,500,000 | | | |
| Additional extension work | 555,000 | 555,000 | 555,000 | 555,000 | | | |
| Alaska | 23,950 | 23,950 | 23,950 | 23,950 | | | |
| Puerto Rico | 140,000 | 274,000 | 274,000 | 274,000 | +$134,000 | | |
| Total, payments to States | 22,698,950 | 22,832,950 | 22,832,950 | 22,832,950 | +134,000 | | |
| Salaries and expenses: Administration and coordination of extension work | [6] 827,200 | 827,200 | 827,200 | 827,200 | | | |
| Total, Extension Service | [6] 23,526,150 | [7] 23,660,150 | [7] 23,660,150 | 23,660,150 | +134,000 | | |
| Agricultural Research Administration: | | | | | | | |
| Office of Administrator (salaries and expenses) | 523,500 | 481,500 | 481,500 | 481,500 | −42,000 | | |
| Special research fund | 1,303,000 | 1,303,000 | 1,203,000 | 1,203,000 | −100,000 | −$100,000 | |
| Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials (rubber investigations) | | 349,000 | 349,000 | 349,000 | +349,000 | | |
| Research on agricultural problems of Alaska | | | [8] 144,940 | 100,000 | +100,000 | +100,000 | −$44,940 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Office of Experiment Stations: | | | | | | | |
| Payments to States: | | | | | | | |
| Hatch Act | 720,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 | | | |
| Adams Act | 720,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 | | | |
| Purnell Act | 2,880,000 | 2,880,000 | 2,880,000 | 2,880,000 | | | |
| Bankhead-Jones Act | 2,663,708 | 2,663,708 | 2,661,268 | 2,663,708 | | | [8a] +2,440 |
| Hawaii | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | | | |
| Alaska | 42,500 | 42,500 | | 42,500 | | | [8a] +42,500 |
| Puerto Rico | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | | | |
| Total, payments to States | 7,206,208 | 7,206,208 | 7,161,268 | 7,203,208 | | | +44,940 |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Administration of grants and coordination of research with States | 194,000 | 211,000 | 211,000 | 211,000 | +17,000 | | |
| Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico | 177,200 | 114,700 | 114,700 | 114,700 | −62,500 | | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 371,200 | 325,700 | 325,700 | 325,700 | −45,500 | | |
| Total, Office of Experiment Stations | 7,577,408 | 7,531,908 | 7,486,968 | 7,531,908 | −45,500 | | +44,940 |

[6] For comparability with the Budget estimate, includes $4,[illegible]00 proposed transfer referred to in footnote 2.
[7] In addition, $4,704,710 is available for payments to States by permanent appropriation without annual action of Congress.
[8] Includes $44,940 transferred by the committee from the appropriations for payments to States and Territories for agricultural experiment stations.
[8a] Transferred by House bill to appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska."

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Animal Industry: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Animal husbandry | $1,136,500 | $1,305,500 | $1,305,500 | $1,305,500 | +$169,000 | | |
| Diseases of animals | 1,000,000 | 1,045,000 | 1,045,000 | 1,045,000 | +45,000 | | |
| Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease | 6,750,000 | 6,750,000 | 6,750,000 | 6,750,000 | | | |
| Inspection and quarantine | [9] 1,400,000 | 1,340,000 | 1,225,197 | 1,225,197 | −174,803 | −$114,803 | |
| Meat inspection | 10,400,000 | 11,140,000 | [10] 5,000,000 | 11,140,000 | +740,000 | | +$6,140,000 |
| Virus Serum Toxin Act | 340,000 | 340,000 | 290,000 | 340,000 | | | +50,000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 21,023,500 | 21,920,500 | 15,615,697 | 21,805,697 | +779,197 | −114,803 | +6,190,000 |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: | | | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | [11] 9,000,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | −8,900,000 | | |
| Reappropriation | 305,000 | | | | −305,000 | | |
| Total, eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | 9,305,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | −9,205,000 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum [12] | [42,500] | [43,000] | [43,000] | [43,000] | [+500] | [.....] | .....] |
| Total, including reappropriation | 30,331,500 | 22,020,500 | 15,715,697 | 21,905,697 | −8,425,803 | −114,803 | +6,190,000 |
| *Deduct* reappropriation | 305,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Bureau of Animal Industry, excluding reappropriation | 30,026,500 | 22,020,500 | 15,715,697 | 21,905,697 | −8,120,803 | −114,803 | +6,190,000 |
| Bureau of Dairy Industry: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | [9]1,093,812 | 1,136,000 | 1,011,000 | 1,011,000 | −82,812 | −125,000 | ..... |
| Repairs at Woodward, Okla., station | ..... | ..... | 5,300 | 5,300 | +5,300 | +5,300 | ..... |
| Total | 1,093,812 | 1,136,000 | 1,016,300 | 1,016,300 | −77,512 | −119,700 | ..... |
| Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Field crops | 2,663,300 | 2,784,000 | 2,784,000 | 2,784,000 | +120,700 | ..... | ..... |
| Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops | 2,245,300 | 2,445,000 | 2,445,000 | 2,445,000 | +199,700 | ..... | ..... |
| Forest diseases | 407,600 | 440,000 | 359,280 | 379,280 | −28,320 | −60,720 | +20,000 |
| Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation | 1,500,000 | 1,541,000 | 1,391,000 | 1,491,000 | −9,000 | −50,000 | +100,000 |
| Agricultural engineering | 637,000 | 637,000 | 637,000 | 637,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| National Arboretum | 85,900 | 761,000 | 436,900 | 436,900 | +351,000 | −324,100 | ..... |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 7,539,100 | 8,608,000 | 8,053,180 | 8,173,180 | +634,080 | −434,820 | +120,000 |
| Southern Great Plains field station | ..... | ..... | 45,600 | 45,600 | +45,600 | +45,600 | ..... |
| Total | 7,539,100 | 8,608,000 | 8,098,780 | 8,218,780 | +679,680 | −389,220 | +120,000 |

[9] Includes $141,000 appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.
[10] To be established as a working capital fund for a meat-inspection service which the committee bill would place on a completely self-supporting basis.
[11] Appropriated by H. J. Res. 154, 80th Cong. (Public Law 22); available until June 30, 1948.
[12] Transfer from the appropriation made by sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933.
[13] Includes $10,000 appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Agricultural Research Administration—Con. | | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Insect investigations | $2,949,500 | $3,150,000 | $2,961,300 | $2,961,300 | +$11,800 | −$188,700 | |
| Insect and plant-disease control | 3,351,600 | 3,467,000 | 2,697,100 | 3,047,100 | −304,500 | −419,900 | +$350,000 |
| Foreign-plant quarantines | 1,742,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | +258,000 | | |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 8,043,100 | 8,617,000 | 7,658,400 | 8,008,400 | −34,700 | −608,600 | +350,000 |
| Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases | 2,800,000 | 2,800,000 | 2,050,000 | 2,050,000 | −750,000 | −750,000 | |
| Total | 10,843,100 | 11,417,000 | 9,708,400 | 10,058,400 | −784,700 | 1,358,600 | +350,000 |
| Tussock-moth control | 395,000 | (14) | | | −395,000 | | |
| Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Agricultural chemical investigations | 511,500 | 511,500 | 511,500 | 511,500 | | | |
| Naval stores investigations | [15] 152,550 | 152,550 | 152,550 | 152,550 | | | |
| Regional research laboratories | 4,920,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | +80,000 | | |
| Total | 5,584,050 | 5,664,050 | 5,664,050 | 5,664,050 | +80,000 | | |
| Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (salaries and expenses) | 1,007,000 | 1,045,000 | 1,045,000 | 800,000 | −207,000 | −245,000 | −245,000 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White-pine blister-rust control: | | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine | 2,754,111 | 1,443,350 | 1,193,350 | 1,193,350 | −1,560,761 | −250,000 | |
| Forest Service | 2,599,471 | 1,974,650 | 1,974,650 | 1,974,650 | −624,821 | | |
| Department of the Interior | 646,418 | 582,000 | 582,000 | 582,000 | −64,418 | | |
| Total | 6,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 3,750,000 | 3,750,000 | −2,250,000 | −250,000 | |
| Forest Service: | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | | |
| General administrative expenses | 682,000 | 682,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | −32,000 | −32,000 | |
| National forest protection and management | [16] 24,496,000 | 25,310,000 | 23,764,891 | 24,014,891 | −481,109 | −1,295,109 | +250,000 |
| Fighting forest fires | [17] 4,044,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | −3,944,000 | | |
| Forest and range-management investigations | 2,630,000 | 2,675,000 | 2,475,000 | 2,475,000 | −155,000 | −200,000 | |
| Forest products | 1,555,000 | 1,555,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,250,000 | −305,000 | −305,000 | +250,000 |
| Forest-resources investigations | 1,072,000 | 1,072,000 | 572,000 | 822,000 | −250,000 | −250,000 | +250,000 |
| Total, salaries and expenses | 34,479,000 | 31,394,000 | 28,561,891 | 29,311,891 | −5,167,109 | −2,082,109 | +750,000 |
| Forest-fire cooperation | 8,300,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | +700,000 | | |
| Farm and other private forestry cooperation | 809,500 | 809,500 | 809,500 | 809,500 | | | |
| Acquisition of lands for national forests | [16] 2,590,000 | 1,000,000 | 500,000 | 750,000 | −1,840,000 | −250,000 | +250,000 |
| Acquisition of lands from national forest receipts | 142,000 | 142,000 | 142,000 | 142,000 | | | |

[14] Balance of this appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1937.
[15] For comparability with the budget estimate, excludes $3,450 proposed transfer in 1948 to the appropriation "Crop and livestock estimates," Bureau of Agricultural Economic (naval stores statistics work).
[16] These figures reflect a transfer of $410,000 from "Aquisition of lands for national forests" to "National-forest protection and management" (for timber sales work) as authorized by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.
[17] Includes $3,944,000 appropriated by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the usual fire-fighting deficiency requirements.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Forest Service—Continued | | | | | | | |
| Control of tree insect epidemics, national forests | $282,500 | (18) | | | −$282,500 | | |
| Total, Forest Service | [19] 46,603,000 | [19] $42,345,500 | [19] $39,013,391 | $40,013,391 | −6,589,609 | −$2,332,109 | +$1,000,000 |
| Forest Roads and Trails: | | | | | | | |
| Forest highways | 13,714,222 | 11,300,000 | 5,300,000 | 8,300,000 | −5,414,222 | −3,000,000 | +3,000,000 |
| Forest development roads | 12,500,000 | 12,500,000 | 10,000,000 | 11,000,000 | −1,500,000 | −1,500,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Total, forest roads and trails | 26,214,222 | 23,800,000 | 15,300,000 | 19,300,000 | −6,914,222 | −4,500,000 | +4,000,000 |
| Flood control | [20] 2,100,000 | [20] 500,000 | [20] 500,000 | 1,500,000 | −600,000 | +1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Soil Conservation Service: | | | | | | | |
| Soil conservation research | 1,423,000 | 1,423,000 | 673,000 | 1,423,000 | | | +750,000 |
| Soil conservation operations | 43,300,000 | 43,437,000 | 38,000,000 | 38,000,000 | −5,300,000 | −5,437,000 | |
| Total, Soil Conservation Service | 44,723,000 | 44,860,000 | 38,673,000 | 39,423,000 | −5,300,000 | −5,437,000 | +750,000 |
| Land Utilization and Retirement of Submarginal Land (title III, Farm Tenant Act) | [21] 1,559,000 | [21] 3,260,000 | [21] 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | +41,000 | −1,660,000 | |
| Water conservation and utilization projects | 700,000 | (22) | (22) | | −700,000 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | | | | | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: | | | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation (excludes special seed program) | 259, 246, 000 | 201, 720, 000 | 165, 614, 290 | 258, 000, 000 | −1, 246, 000 | +56, 280, 000 | +92, 385, 710 |
| Special seed program | 12, 500, 000 | | | | −12, 500, 000 | | |
| Reappropriation from sec. 32 balances | 42, 500, 000 | | | | −42, 500, 000 | | |
| Transfer from 1948, sec. 32 funds | | 100, 000, 000 | (23) | | | −100, 000, 000 | |
| Total | 314, 246, 000 | 301, 720, 000 | 165, 614, 290 | 258, 000, 000 | −56, 246, 000 | −43, 720, 000 | +92, 385, 710 |
| *Deduct* reappropriation and transfer | −42, 500, 000 | −100, 000, 000 | | | +42, 500, 000 | +100, 000, 000 | |
| Total, conservation and use, excluding reappropriation and transfer | 271, 746, 000 | 201, 720, 000 | 165, 614, 290 | 258, 000, 000 | −13, 746, 000 | +56, 280, 000 | +92, 385, 710 |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item: | | | | | | | |
| National and State expenses (1947 amount includes provision for pay costs under Public Law 390) | [8, 871, 868] | [9, 280, 813] | [1, 950, 000] | [7, 080, 813] | [−1, 791, 055] | [−2, 200, 000] | [+5, 130, 813] |
| Peanut marketing quotas (estimate in S. Doc. 71) | | [2, 315, 055] | | [1, 766, 387] | [+1, 766, 387] | [−548, 668] | [+1, 766, 387] |
| County associations | [20, 039, 088] | [24, 489, 088] | [13, 050, 000] | [18, 652. 800] | [−1, 386, 288] | [−5, 836, 288] | [+5, 602, 800] |
| Total, administrative expense limitation | [28, 910, 956] | [36, 084, 956] | [15, 000, 000] | [27, 500, 000] | [−1, 410, 956] | [−8, 584, 956] | [+12, 500, 000] |
| Sugar Act | 53, 500, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | 55, 000, 000 | +1, 500, 000 | | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32 funds): | | | | | | | |
| Reappropriation | 65, 568, 710 | | | | −65, 568, 710 | | |

[18] Balance of the appropriation, made by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, will be available until Dec. 31, 1948.
[19] In addition, permanent appropriations are available as indicated at the end of this table.
[20] In addition, prior year balances are available for use.
[21] In addition, a permanent appropriation is available as indicated at the end of this table.
[22] To be financed in 1948 from prior year balance (*estimated* in the budget at $1,042,576).
[23] The House bill recommends rescission of the full amount of the sec. 32 appropriation for 1948.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

## TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Administrative expense limitation on funds under this item—Continued | | | | | | | |
| National School Lunch Act | [24] $81,000,000 | $75,000,000 | $45,000,000 | [26a] $75,000,000 | −$6,000,000 | | +$30,000,000 |
| *Deduct* transfer in 1947 from sec. 32 funds | −75,000,000 | | | −75,000,000 | | | −75,000,000 |
| Total, National School Lunch Act, excluding transfer | 6,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 45,000,000 | ([26a]) | −6,000,000 | −$75,000,000 | −45,000,000 |
| Administration of marketing agreements and orders | ([25]) | ([25]) | 525,300 | | | | −525,300 |
| Marketing services: | | | | | | | |
| Market news service | 1,450,972 | 1,520,000 | 1,527,500 | 1,566,250 | +115,278 | +46,250 | +38,750 |
| Market inspection of farm products | 596,000 | 712,000 | 712,000 | 712,000 | +116,000 | | |
| Marketing farm products | 2,511,500 | 1,400,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,100,000 | −1,411,500 | −300,000 | +100,000 |
| Tobacco Acts | 1,344,000 | 1,552,000 | 1,552,000 | 1,552,000 | +208,000 | | |
| Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency and Standard Container Acts | 239,800 | 294,000 | 294,000 | 294,000 | +54,200 | | |
| Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | 1,399,000 | | | |
| United States Grain Standards Act | 1,055,000 | 1,128,000 | 1,128,000 | 1,128,000 | +73,000 | | |
| United States Warehouse Act | 640,000 | 685,000 | 585,000 | 585,000 | −55,000 | −100,000 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Federal Seed Act | 152,500 | 152,500 | 152,500 | 152,500 | | | |
| Packers and Stockyards Act | 519,700 | 528,000 | 528,000 | 528,000 | +8,300 | | |
| Naval Stores Act | 38,100 | 41,000 | 41,000 | 41,000 | +2,900 | | |
| Insecticide Act | 293,500 | 293,500 | 293,500 | 293,500 | | | |
| Freight rates for farm products | 138,000 | 138,000 | 138,000 | 138,000 | | | |
| Total, marketing services | 10,378,072 | 9,843,000 | 9,350,500 | 9,489,250 | −888,822 | −353,750 | +138,750 |
| Supply and distribution of farm labor | [26] 12,000,000 | | | | −12,000,000 | | |
| Commodity Exchange Authority: | | | | | | | |
| Commodity Exchange Act | 521,000 | 650,000 | 530,000 | 530,000 | +9,000 | −120,000 | |
| Farmers' Home Administration: | | | | | | | |
| Farm tenant loans | 50,000,000 | 35,000,000 | | 20,000,000 | −30,000,000 | −15,000,000 | +20,000,000 |
| Production and subsistence loans | [27] 95,611,282 | 90,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 60,000,000 | −35,611,282 | −30,000,000 | |
| Farm tenant mortgage insurance fund | | 15,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | −14,000,000 | |
| Salaries and expenses | [28] 34,428,300 | 30,000,000 | 18,000,000 | 24,000,000 | −10,428,300 | −6,000,000 | +6,000,000 |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration | 180,039,582 | 170,000,000 | 79,000,000 | 105,000,000 | −75,039,582 | −65,000,000 | +26,000,000 |
| *Deduct—* | | | | | | | |
| Reappropriations | −25,410,582 | | | | +25,410,582 | | |
| RFC loan authorizations | −120,000,000 | | | | +120,000,000 | | |
| Total, Farmers' Home Administration, direct appropriations | 34,629,000 | 170,000,000 | 79,000,000 | 105,000,000 | +70,371,000 | −65,000,000 | +26,000,000 |

[24] Includes $6,000,000 appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[25] Included under the sec. 32 permanent appropriation which the committee bill rescinds for 1948; new appropriation item is recommended to provide for administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

[26] Appropriated in Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (calendar year appropriation; presently available until December 31, 1947, under the terms of Public Law 40, 80th Cong., which also provides for liquidation of the program within 30 days thereafter). Does not include $5,000,000 appropriated in Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, which act continued funds for the farm labor supply program until Jan. 30, 1948, for carrying out the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, as amended, and supplemented and the act of April 28, 1947 (Public Law 40, 80th Cong.).

[26a] Senate bill makes available $75,000,000 from sec. 32 funds.

[27] Consists of funds originally made available for rural rehabilitation and crop-production and harvesting loans which were combined pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946. A portion of the total represents estimated collections during fiscal year 1947; thus the figure is subject to revision based on actual collections.

[28] Consists of funds originally made available for expenses in connection with the rural rehabilitation, farm tenant, and crop production and harvesting loan programs, which have been reorganized and integrated under the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Water Facilities, Arid and Semiarid Areas | $1,750,000 | $1,750,000 | $1,750,000 | $1,750,000 | | | |
| Rural Electrification Administration: | | | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 5,550,000 | 5,600,000 | 4,000,000 | 5,000,000 | −$550,000 | −$600,000 | +$1,000,000 |
| Loans: | | | | | | | |
| Loan authorization | 250,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 250,000,000 | | +25,000,000 | +25,000,000 |
| Direct appropriation | | 25,000,000 | | | | −25,000,000 | |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration | 255,550,000 | 255,600,000 | 229,000,000 | 255,000,000 | −550,000 | −600,000 | +26,000,000 |
| *Deduct* loan authorization | −250,000,000 | −225,000,000 | −225,000,000 | −250,000,000 | | −25,000,000 | −25,000,000 |
| Total, Rural Electrification Administration direct appropriation | 5,550,000 | 30,600,000 | 4,000,000 | 5,000,000 | −550,000 | −25,600,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Farm Credit Administration (salaries and expenses): | | | | | | | |
| Direct appropriation | 584,000 | 561,000 | 561,000 | 561,000 | −23,000 | | |
| Assessments against member institutions of the farm credit system | [29] 2,680,090 | [29] 2,781,000 | [29] 2,781,000 | 2,781,000 | +100,910 | | |
| Transfer from "Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans" | [102,015] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [−102,015] | [ ] | [ ] |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total, Farm Credit Administration, direct appropriations | 3, 264, 090 | 3, 342, 000 | 3, 342, 000 | 3, 342, 000 | +77, 910 | | |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, and transfers from permanent appropriations (title I) | 1, 211, 243, 503 | 1, 110, 811, 608 | 783, 172, 266 | 974, 836, 426 | −236, 407, 077 | −135, 975, 182 | +188, 664, 160 |

[29] *Estimated* assessments. Subject to revision.

## TITLE II.—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: | | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses (appropriation) | $7, 790, 000 | $9, 330, 000 | $1, 000, 000 | $5, 000, 000 | −$2, 790, 000 | −$4, 330, 000 | +$4, 000, 000 |
| Appropriation for use of Secretary of Treasury in subscribing to capital stock | [30] 20, 000, 000 | [31] 10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | −10, 000, 000 | | |
| Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 11, 000, 000 | 15, 000, 000 | −12, 790, 000 | −4, 330, 000 | +4, 000, 000 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation (limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds) | [8, 760, 000] | [[32] 8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [ ] | [ ] |
| Total appropriations (title II) | 27, 790, 000 | 19, 330, 000 | 11, 000, 000 | 15, 000, 000 | −12, 790, 000 | −4, 330, 000 | +4, 000, 000 |

## TOTALS, ALL TITLES

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totals: | | | | | | | |
| Direct appropriations | $660, 249, 211 | $805, 141, 608 | $572, 172, 266 | $664, 836, 426 | +$4, 587, 215 | −$140, 305, 182 | +$92, 664, 160 |
| Reappropriations | 133, 784, 292 | | | | −133, 784, 292 | | |
| Loan authorizations | 370, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 225, 000, 000 | 250, 000, 000 | −120, 000, 000 | +25, 000, 000 | +25, 000, 000 |
| Transfer of funds from permanent appropriations | 75, 000, 000 | 100, 000, 000 | | 75, 000, 000 | | −25, 000, 000 | +75, 000, 000 |
| Limitation on administrative expenses from corporate funds | [8, 760, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [8, 450, 000] | [−310, 000] | [ ] | [ ] |
| Grand totals, excluding net permanent appropriations | 1, 239, 033, 503 | 1, 130, 141, 608 | 797, 172, 266 | 989, 836, 426 | −249, 197, 077 | −140, 305, 182 | +192, 664, 160 |

[30] Contained in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947. Originally submitted as a 1948 budget estimate "to be immediately available."
[31] Additional recommendation contained in H. Doc. 214, 80th Cong.
[32] Represents a revision of the original estimate (see H. Doc. 186, 80th Cong.).

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

## TOTALS, ALL TITLES—Continued

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | Recommended in House bill, 1948 | Recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−) committee bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947 appropriation | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 |
| Totals—Continued | | | | | | | |
| *Add* net total for permanent appropriations shown in table following | $52,747,348 | $58,429,710 | $50,429,710 | $58,429,710 | +$5,682,362 | | +8,000,000 |
| Grand totals, including permanents | 1,291,780,851 | 1,188,571,318 | 847,601,976 | 1,048,266,136 | −243,514,715 | −$140,305,182 | +$200,664,160 |
| *Deduct* transfers authorized to be made between existing appropriations to meet pay costs under Public Law 390, 79th Cong | −17,094,800 | | | | +17,094,800 | | |
| Grand totals (net) | 1,274,686,051 | 1,188,571,318 | 847,601,976 | 1,048,266,136 | −226,419,915 | −140,305,182 | +200,664,160 |

## PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

[NOTE.—Includes figures on funds recommended for rescission in title III of the accompanying bill]

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cooperative agricultural extension work | $4,704,710 | $4,704,710 | $4,704,710 | $4,704,710 | | | |
| Payments to States and Territories from national forest fund | [33] 3,425,000 | [33] 3,950,000 | 3,950,000 | 3,950,000 | +$525,000 | | |
| Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national forest fund | [33] 39,000 | [33] 39,000 | 39,000 | 39,000 | | | |
| Roads and trails for States, national forest fund | [33] 1,370,000 | [33] 1,580,000 | 1,580,000 | 1,580,000 | +210,000 | | |
| Payments to counties, submarginal land program | [33] 156,000 | [33] 156,000 | 156,000 | 156,000 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Sec. 32 funds (see deductions below) | 118,052,638 | [33] 148,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 123,000,000 | +4,947,362 | −$25,000,000 | +$83,000,000 |
| Total, permanent appropriations | 127,747,348 | 158,429,710 | 50,429,710 | 133,429,710 | +5,682,362 | −25,000,000 | +83,000,000 |
| *Deduct* transfers from sec. 32 funds to "National School Lunch Act" in 1947 and recommended by Senate for 1948 and to "Conservation and use" in 1948 estimates | −75,000,000 | −100,000,000 | | −75,000,000 | | +25,000,000 | −75,000,000 |
| Net total for permanents, excluding transfers | 52,747,348 | 58,429,710 | 50,429,710 | 58,429,710 | +5,682,362 | | +8,000,000 |
| **REAPPROPRIATIONS** | | | | | | | |
| Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals | $305,000 | | | | −$305,000 | | |
| Conservation and use of agricultural land resources | 42,500,000 | | | | −42,500,000 | | |
| Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32 funds) | [33] 65,568,710 | | | | −65,568,710 | | |
| Farmers' Home Administration | [33] 25,410,582 | | | | −25,410,582 | | |
| Total, reappropriations | 133,784,292 | | | | −133,784,292 | | |
| **LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | | | | | |
| Farm tenancy loans | $50,000,000 | | | | −$50,000,000 | | |
| Production and subsistence loans | 70,000,000 | | | | −70,000,000 | | |
| Rural electrification loans | 250,000,000 | $225,000,000 | $225,000,000 | $250,000,000 | | +$25,000,000 | +$25,000,000 |
| Total loan authorizations | 370,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 250,000,000 | −120,000,000 | +25,000,000 | +25,000,000 |

[33] Preliminary figures. Subject to revision.

*Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for 1947, the budget estimates for 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948*—Continued

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets [ ] not included in totals]

**TRUST FUNDS**

| Item | Appropriations, 1947 [35] | Budget estimates, 1948 | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Forest Service: | | | |
| Cooperative work | $3,500,000 | $3,500,000 | |
| Construction of forest access roads to standing timber | 11,300,000 | | −$11,300,000 |
| Production and Marketing Administration: | | | |
| Moisture content and grade determinations | 1,354,000 | 1,354,000 | |
| Indemnity fund, county associations | 2,000 | 2,000 | |
| Undistributed cotton price-adjustment payments | 300 | 300 | |
| Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products | 5,600,000 | 5,000,000 | −600,000 |
| Grading of agricultural commodities | 800,000 | 754,000 | −46,000 |
| Farmers' Home Administration: | | | |
| Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects | 55,000 | | −55,000 |
| State rural rehabilitation corporation funds | 9,250,000 | 9,000,000 | −250,000 |
| Liquidation of deposits, lease, and purchase contracts | 100,000 | 50,000 | −50,000 |
| Miscellaneous contributed funds | 159,530 | 229,000 | +69,470 |
| Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps | 2,914 | 2,600 | −314 |
| Unearned fees and other charges, unclaimed moneys, etc | 200 | 200 | |
| Total, trust accounts | 32,123,944 | 19,892,100 | −12,231,844 |

[35] Figures in several cases are preliminary and subject to revision based on actual amounts finally made available for the year.

O

Calendar No. 493

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. 474]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1947

Reported by Mr. BROOKS, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

# TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For personal services in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the

1 Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be trans-
2 ferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or
3 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
5 the Department shall determine are appropriate to the re-
6 quirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such
7 appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That, of
8 appropriations herein made which are available for the pur-
9 chase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each
10 option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land:
11 *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by
12 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or
13 employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee,
14 or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission,
15 or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any predic-
16 tion, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threat-
17 ened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future
18 prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further*,
19 That, except to provide materials required in or incident to
20 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
21 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this
22 Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured
23 from commodities or materials produced outside of the United
24 States.

PENALTY MAIL

For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944 (39 U. S. C. 321d), ~~$3,186,000~~ *$3,486,000.*

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including in addition to the objects for which funds are available for such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration, planning, and coordination of research under section 10 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Act, as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, ~~$3,000,000~~ *$2,500,000,* ~~of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and make a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching requirement~~*: Provided, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said Act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out "authorized to*

1 *be appropriated under section 9 (a)" and inserting in lieu*
2 *thereof "appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a)"*;

3 For research on utilization and associated problems
4 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, ~~$2,500,000~~ *$3,-*
5 *000,000*;

6 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
7 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
8 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act, $1,500,000;

9 For the improvement and development, independently or
10 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
11 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
12 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
13 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
14 14, 1946), ~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,500,000*;

15 In all, ~~$9,000,000~~ *$9,500,000*: *Provided,* That such
16 sums as may be necessary for penalty mail as required by the
17 Act of June 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular
18 departmental appropriation therefor: *Provided further,* That
19 for necessary printing and binding there may be transferred
20 to, and made a part of, the item "Printing and binding,
21 Department of Agriculture," such sums as are necessary:
22 *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to
23 any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts
24 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the
25 functions for which it is made, and any such amounts shall

be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, ~~$2,025,000~~ *$2,225,000,* together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed ~~$1,597,000~~ *$1,500,000*: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau

1 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
2 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
3 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases
4 in such appropriations or authorizations.

5 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
8 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
9 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
10 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
11 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
12 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
13 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
14 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
15 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
16 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
17 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
18 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
19 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
20 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
21 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
22 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
23 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
25 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-

1 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
2 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
3 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be
4 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
5 which may be expended for personal services in the District
6 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
7 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
8 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
9 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
10 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
11 tions: *Provided further*, That when and to the extent that
12 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
13 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
14 of the various agencies of the Department can be more ad-
15 vantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
16 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
17 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
18 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
19 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
20 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
21 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That in
22 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
23 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
24 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
25 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944

1 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
2 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
3 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*
4 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
5 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
6 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
7 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
8 Francisco radio office.

9 PRINTING AND BINDING

10 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
11 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
12 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
13 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
14 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
15 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
16 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
17 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
18 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
19 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
20 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
21 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
22 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent
23 out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators,
24 Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall

1 direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants
2 of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on
3 Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C.. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
5 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
6 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
7 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
8 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
9 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
10 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
11 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
12 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
13 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
14 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
15 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
16 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
17 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
18 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
19 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
20 ~~for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing~~
21 ~~Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d), such~~
22 ~~sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in con-~~
23 ~~nection therewith~~ *to carry into effect the terms of section 32*
24 *of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as*
25 *amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and*

1 *binding in connection with the activities under section 32:*
2 *Provided further,* That the total amount that may be trans-
3 ferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso
4 shall not exceed ~~$95,300~~ *$170,000.*

5 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

6 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
7 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,
8 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
9 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
10 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
11 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
12 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
13 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
14 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

16 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
17 ~~$1,887,000~~ *$2,387,000* for personal services in the Dis-
18 trict of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at
19 $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the
20 purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers,
21 as follows:

22 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
23 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
24 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
25 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation

1 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
2 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
3 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
4 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
5 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
6 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
7 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
8 their variations and trends, ~~$1,743,600~~ *$2,243,600*: *Pro-*
9 *vided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated or
10 made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
11 under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used
12 for State and county land-use planning, for conducting
13 cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.
14 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
15 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
16 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
17 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
18 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
19 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
20 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
21 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
22 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
23 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
24 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided,*

1 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-
2 able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or
3 publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
4 acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
5 production for other than the commercial crop.

6 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
7 RELATIONS

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the
9 Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling
10 the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the
11 Department in connection with foreign agricultural work,
12 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
13 not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $428,000.

14 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
15 COMMITTEES

16 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
17 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
18 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
19 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
20 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
21 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
22 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
23 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
24 thereto.

1 EXTENSION SERVICE

2 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO

3 RICO

4 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
5 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
6 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
7 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
8 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
9 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
10 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
11 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
12 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
13 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
14 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
15 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
16 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
17 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
18 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
19 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
20 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
21 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
22 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
23 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
24 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2 Administration and coordination of extension work:
3 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
4 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–
5 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
6 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
7 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
8 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
13 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
14 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
16 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
17 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
18 to the Department, from Government surplus without
19 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
20 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
21 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
22 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
23 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
24 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*

1 That the appropriation current at the time services are
2 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
3 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
4 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
5 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
6 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
7 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
8 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
9 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center
10 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
11 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
12 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
13 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
14 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
15 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
16 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
17 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
18 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
19 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
20 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
21 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
22 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
23 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
24 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
25 tor, whichever is greater.

1 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
2 AGRICULTURE

3 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
4 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
5 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
6 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
7 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
8 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by
9 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
10 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
11 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
12 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
13 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
14 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
15 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

16 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
17 MATERIALS

18 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
19 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
20 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
21 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
22 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
23 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
24 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of

1 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
2 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
3 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
4 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
5 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
6 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
7 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
8 $865,000.

9 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

10 ~~To enable the Secretary, through such officers and~~
11 ~~employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-~~
12 ~~tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain~~
13 ~~a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and~~
14 ~~problems of the Territory of Alaska $144,940, including~~
15 ~~printing and binding, the employment of personal services~~
16 ~~in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-~~
17 ~~tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to~~
18 ~~restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program~~
19 ~~the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have~~
20 ~~heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the~~
21 ~~Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station~~
22 ~~of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United~~
23 ~~States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and~~
24 ~~with other public and private agencies. The provisions of~~

1 ~~this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of~~
2 ~~the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take~~
3 ~~such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine~~
4 ~~to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-~~
5 ~~under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use~~
6 ~~of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds~~
7 ~~of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including~~
8 ~~its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than~~
9 ~~any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-~~
10 ~~poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable~~
11 ~~continue the employment of the existing personnel of the~~
12 ~~station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-~~
13 ~~cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby~~
14 ~~transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-~~
15 ~~ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for~~
16 ~~credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the~~
17 ~~legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-~~
18 ~~struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-~~
19 ~~tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be~~
20 ~~unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall~~
21 ~~be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-~~
22 ~~tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the~~
23 ~~transfer.~~

1 ~~OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS~~

2 ~~PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO~~

3 ~~For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico~~
4 ~~to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the~~
5 ~~provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural~~
6 ~~experiments stations:~~

7 ~~Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related~~
8 ~~Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.~~
9 ~~C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), $720,000; Adams Act,~~
10 ~~the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),~~
11 ~~$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,~~
12 ~~1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373, 376, 380, 382),~~
13 ~~$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-~~
14 ~~proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), $2,661,268,~~
15 ~~none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the~~
16 ~~Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b),~~
17 ~~extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the~~
18 ~~Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act~~
19 ~~approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d-~~
20 ~~386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress~~
21 ~~to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,~~
22 ~~and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.~~

23 ~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

24 ~~Administration of grants and coordination of research~~
25 ~~with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed~~

1 ~~$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia,~~
2 ~~to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,~~
3 ~~1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928,~~
4 ~~March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amenda-~~
5 ~~tory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-369, 370-383,~~
6 ~~386, 386d-386f); relative to their administration and for the~~
7 ~~administration of an agricultural experiment station in~~
8 ~~Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe~~
9 ~~the form of the annual financial statement required under the~~
10 ~~above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accord-~~
11 ~~ance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of~~
12 ~~the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the~~
13 ~~lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department~~
14 ~~in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.~~
15 *To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the*
16 *Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish*
17 *and maintain a program for research into the basic agricul-*
18 *tural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska,*
19 *$100,000, including printing and binding, the employment*
20 *of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisi-*
21 *tion of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary*
22 *buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of exist-*
23 *ing law, including the construction of such buildings and*
24 *facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.*

1 *Office of Experiment Stations*

2 *PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND*

3 *PUERTO RICO*

4 *For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*
5 *Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect*
6 *the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural*
7 *experiment stations:*

8 *Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related*
9 *Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U.*
10 *S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams*
11 *Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),*
12 *$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,*
13 *1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380,*
14 *382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act*
15 *approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),*
16 *$2,663,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928*
17 *(7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain*
18 *Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000;*
19 *Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.*
20 *386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Terri-*
21 *tory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of*
22 *the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), ex-*
23 *tending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the*
24 *Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500;*
25 *Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended*

1 *(7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain*
2 *Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments*
3 *to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.*
4 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*
5 *Administration of grants and coordination of research*
6 *with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed*
7 *$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia,*
8 *to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,*
9 *1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16,*
10 *1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20,*
11 *1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363,*
12 *365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and*
13 *for the administration of an agricultural experiment*
14 *station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall*
15 *prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required*
16 *under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are*
17 *in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research*
18 *work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment sta-*
19 *tions in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of*
20 *the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon*
21 *to Congress.*
22 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
23 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
24 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
25 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

1 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
4 ~~$1,059,000~~ *$1,061,840* for departmental personal services
5 in the District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
6 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
7 Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned
8 with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic
9 raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

10 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
11 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
12 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
13 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
14 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
15 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
16 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

17 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
18 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
19 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.

20 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
21 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
22 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
23 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
24 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
25 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-

1 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
2 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
3 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
4 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
5 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
6 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
7 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
8 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That
9 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
10 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
11 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
12 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
13 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
14 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
15 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
16 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
17 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

18 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
19 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
20 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
21 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
22 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
23 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
24 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance

with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, $1,225,197.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, ~~$5,000,000~~ *$11,140,000*, ~~for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and~~

1 ~~other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia~~
2 ~~and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal~~
3 ~~Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District~~
4 ~~of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger~~
5 ~~motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase~~
6 ~~of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized~~
7 ~~by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other~~
8 ~~necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary~~
9 ~~of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of~~
10 ~~bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the~~
11 ~~interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-~~
12 ~~draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges~~
13 ~~or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-~~
14 ~~ment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical~~
15 ~~services may be rendered to Government and other public~~
16 ~~agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein~~
17 ~~provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations~~
18 ~~and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the~~
19 ~~close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for~~
20 ~~the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the~~
21 ~~Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*~~
22 ~~*further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service~~
23 ~~rendered on and after July 1, 1947.~~

24 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
25 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),

1 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
2 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
3 factured in the United States and the importation of such
4 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
5 animals, ~~$290,000~~ *$340,000.*

6 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
7 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
8 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
9 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
10 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
11 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
12 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
13 services in the District of Columbia.

14 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
15 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

16 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
17 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-
18 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
19 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
20 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
21 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
22 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
23 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
24 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
25 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar

1 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
2 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
3 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
4 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
5 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
6 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
7 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
8 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
9 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
10 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
11 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
12 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
13 United States Government for any such animals shall not
14 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
15 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
16 appraisal is the same for each bird.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
19 not to exceed ~~$500,000~~ *$540,912* for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act
21 of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investiga-
22 tions, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry,
23 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May
24 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or
25 renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946

1 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S.
2 C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process
3 or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

4 For repair of buildings, fence, electric line and feed
5 bunk, recently damaged by tornado at the dairy field station,
6 Woodward, Oklahoma, $5,300.

7 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
8 ENGINEERING

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
12 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
13 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
14 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
15 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
16 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
17 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
18 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
19 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
20 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
21 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
22 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
23 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
24 as follows:

25 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-

1 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn,
2 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
3 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
4 field crops, $2,784,000.

5 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
6 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
7 table, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
8 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
9 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
10 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
11 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
12 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
13 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
14 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
15 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dade
16 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
17 mately $7,000.

18 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
19 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
20 control, ~~$359,280~~ *$379,280.*

21 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
22 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
23 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
24 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
25 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural

1 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
2 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
3 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
4 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
5 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
6 cropping and improved soil management; ~~$1,391,000~~
7 *$1,491,000.*

8 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
9 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
10 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
11 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
12 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
13 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
14 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
15 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
16 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

17 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
18 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
19 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
20 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
21 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
22 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
23 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
24 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of

1 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act
2 of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).
3 Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement
4 and repair of buildings, equipment and supplies, utilities,
5 fences and other general repairs and clean-up operations
6 from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward,
7 Oklahoma, $45,600.

8 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
12 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means
13 of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agri-
14 culture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
15 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
16 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
17 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
18 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the
19 provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,
20 as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7
21 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
22 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and
23 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the
24 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious

1 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-
2 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
3 and not to exceed ~~$692,000~~ *$709,440* for personal services
4 in the District of Columbia, as follows:

5 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
6 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
7 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
8 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
9 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
10 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
11 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
12 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
13 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
14 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
15 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
16 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
17 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
18 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
19 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
20 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
21 tion, $2,961,300.

22 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
23 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
24 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,

1 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal
2 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
3 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
4 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
5 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
6 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
7 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
8 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
9 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
10 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
11 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
12 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
13 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
14 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), ~~$2,697,100~~ *$3,047,100*:
15 *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to
16 pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or
17 other property injured or destroyed: *Provided further,* That,
18 in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropria-
19 tion shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil
20 in any State until such State has provided cooperation neces-
21 sary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication
22 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
23 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
24 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
25 tions for the accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided fur-*

1 *ther*, That in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures
2 from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods
3 of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where meas-
4 ures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
5 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
6 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
7 or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor
8 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
9 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State,
10 county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations
11 concerned: *Provided, however*, That expenditures incurred for
12 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
13 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
14 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*,
15 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
16 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
17 disease except where such trees are located on property
18 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
19 or on property included within local experimental control
20 areas.

21 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
22 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
23 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
24 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
25 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7

1 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
2 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
3 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
4 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
5 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
6 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
8 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
9 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
10 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
11 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

12 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
13 PLANT DISEASES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
16 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
17 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys
18 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
19 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
20 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to

1 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, as follows:
3 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
4 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
5 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
6 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
7 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
8 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
9 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
10 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
11 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
12 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
13 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
14 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
15 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
16 investigations; $511,500, and there shall be transferred to
17 the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from
18 Government surplus without compensation therefor, a cer-
19 tain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (con-
20 sisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser Subdivision,
21 and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728 in the city of Pasadena,
22 California), valued at approximately $15,800.
23 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
24 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;

1 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
2 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
3 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
4 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.

5 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re-
6 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)
7 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
8 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
9 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
10 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
11 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
12 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

13 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

14 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
15 ing not to exceed ~~$381,700~~ *$305,000* for personal services in
16 the District of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the
17 relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food,
18 clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions
19 of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of
20 such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
21 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
22 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
23 and for disseminating useful information on this subject,
24 ~~$1,045,000~~ *$800,000.*

1 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

2 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
3 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
4 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
5 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
7 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of
8 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
9 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
10 States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service
11 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
12 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
13 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
14 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
15 method development, and for operations conducted under
16 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to,
17 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
18 State and privately owned lands.

19 FOREST SERVICE

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
22 ~~$1,055,378~~ *$1,083,378* for personal services in the District
23 of Columbia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
24 suant to the second sentence of 706 (a) of the Organic Act
25 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the

1 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-
2 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
3 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
4 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
5 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
6 be used for any experiment or test made outside
7 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of
8 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
9 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
10 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
11 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
12 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
13 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
14 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
15 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
16 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
17 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
18 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any
19 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
20 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
21 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
22 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
23 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
24 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
25 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil

1 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
2 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
3 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
4 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
5 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
6 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
7 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National
8 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
9 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
10 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
11 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
12 posters and related printed material, as follows:

13 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
14 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
15 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
16 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
17 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

18 National forest protection and management: For the
19 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
20 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
21 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
22 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
23 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
24 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
25 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to

1 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
2 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
3 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
4 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
5 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
6 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
7 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-
8 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
9 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
10 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
11 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
12 timber cultural operations; development and application
13 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
14 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
15 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
16 appraising of timber and other resources and development
17 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,
18 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
19 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
20 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
21 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
22 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
23 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
24 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
25 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or

1 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
2 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
3 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
4 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
5 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
6 ~~$23,764,891~~ *$24,014,891*, of which not to exceed $25,-
7 000 shall be available for the purchase of one nursery site.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
10 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
12 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
13 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

14 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
15 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
16 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
17 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
18 nance of improvements, as follows:

19 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
20 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
21 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
22 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
23 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
24 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
25 $2,475,000.

1 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
2 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
3 Laboratory, or elsewhere, ~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,250,000,* of
4 which at least $11,050 shall be expended for research in the
5 utilization of waste woods.

6 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
7 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
8 under section 10, ~~$572,000~~ *$822,000.*

9 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

10 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
11 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
12 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
13 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
14 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
15 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
16 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

17 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

18 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
19 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
20 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
21 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
22 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
23 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
24 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
25 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and

1 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
2 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
3 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
4 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
5 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766),
6 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),
7 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
8 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
9 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
10 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
11 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
12 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
13 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
14 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
15 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

16 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

17 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
18 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
19 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), ~~$500,000~~ *$750,000,*
20 ~~to be available only for payment toward the purchase price~~
21 ~~of any lands acquired~~*; the administrative cost of such acqui-*
22 *sition to be met from the appropriation "National Forest*
23 *Protection and Management".*

24 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
25 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-

1 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
2 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
3 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
4 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
5 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
6 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
7 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
8 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;
9 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
10 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
11 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
12 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
13 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
14 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
15 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
16 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National
17 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
18 $35,000; in all $142,000.

19 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

20 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
21 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
22 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
23 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
24 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
25 Service administration, (1) ~~$10,000,000~~ *$11,000,000* for
26 forest development roads and trails, and (2) ~~$5,300,000~~

1 *$8,300,000* for forest highways, which sums are author-
2 ized to be appropriated by the Act of December 20,
3 1944 (Public Law 521), in all, ~~$15,300,000~~ *$19,300,000*
4 (including not to exceed ~~$100,000~~ *$109,530* for per-
5 sonal services in the District of Columbia), to be imme-
6 diately available and to remain available until expended:
7 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
8 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
9 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and
10 supplies used for road and trail construction and main-
11 tenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased,
12 altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not
13 exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building
14 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
15 $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year
16 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of
17 such building as certified by the Secretary.

18 FLOOD CONTROL

19 Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance
20 with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as
21 amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examina-
22 tions and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
23 ~~$500,000~~ *$1,500,000,* including personal services in the Dis-
24 trict of Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain
25 available until expended, with which shall be merged the un-
26 expended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or trans-

ferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated~~: *Provided further,* That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances~~: *Provided further, That $1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.*

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, including not to exceed ~~$838,500~~ *$875,000* for personal services in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,

1 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or
2 sanitary system and connecting the same with any such
3 building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings
4 are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for
5 other purposes and except for eight buildings to be con-
6 structed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
7 *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this
8 Act shall be available for the construction of any such
9 building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided*
10 *further,* That in the State of Missouri where the State
11 has established a central State agency authorized to enter
12 into agreements with the United States or any of its
13 agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
14 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
15 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
16 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
17 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
18 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
19 as follows:

20 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
21 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
22 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and
23 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
24 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
25 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
26 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all

1 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
2 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
3 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for con-
4 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental water-
5 sheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, ~~$673,000~~
6 *$1,423,000.*

7 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
8 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
9 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
10 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
11 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation
12 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
13 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
14 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
15 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
16 in demonstration projects.

17 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
18 SUBMARGINAL LAND

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
20 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
21 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions
22 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
23 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

1 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
2 ADMINISTRATION
3 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
4 RESOURCES

5 ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
6 ~~carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 71, inclusive,~~
7 ~~of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-~~
8 ~~proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-~~
9 ~~590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment~~
10 ~~Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except~~
11 ~~the provisions of sections 201, 202, 203, 381, and 383 and~~
12 ~~the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-~~
13 ~~ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for~~
14 ~~the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-~~
15 ~~plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the~~
16 ~~United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until De-~~
17 ~~cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said~~
18 ~~provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as~~
19 ~~amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,~~
20 ~~during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,~~
21 ~~inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of~~
22 ~~the total sum provided under this head shall be available~~
23 ~~during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-~~
24 ~~ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but~~
25 ~~not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the ap-~~

1 ~~propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,~~
2 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*~~
3 ~~That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the~~
4 ~~certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such~~
5 ~~form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out~~
6 ~~the conservation practice or practices and has complied with~~
7 ~~all other requirements as conditions for such payments and~~
8 ~~that the statements and information contained in the applica-~~
9 ~~tion for payment are correct and true, to the best of his~~
10 ~~knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March~~
11 ~~4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further,*~~
12 ~~That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available~~
13 ~~for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment~~
14 ~~Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of~~
15 ~~February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or~~
16 ~~expenses of any regional information employees or any~~
17 ~~State or county information employees, but this shall not~~
18 ~~preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-~~
19 ~~tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds~~
20 ~~shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses~~
21 ~~in connection with the formulation or administration of any~~
22 ~~1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-~~
23 ~~conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,~~
24 ~~as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment~~
25 ~~Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-~~

1 ~~ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the~~
2 ~~Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer~~
3 ~~to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-~~
4 ~~sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing~~
5 ~~payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such~~
6 ~~amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-~~
7 ~~lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any~~
8 ~~soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-~~
9 ~~cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming~~
10 ~~practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program~~
11 ~~under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*~~
12 ~~*further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make~~
13 ~~payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-~~
14 ~~ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated~~
15 ~~pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-~~
16 ~~tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-~~
17 ~~tary determines that, because of induction into the armed~~
18 ~~forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were~~
19 ~~prevented from filing, applications for payment under any~~
20 ~~such program during the period the applicable appropri-~~
21 ~~ation for such program was available for obligation,~~
22 ~~such payments to be made out of the unobligated~~
23 ~~balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use~~
24 ~~of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of~~
25 ~~Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*~~

1 ~~That an application for payment on the prescribed form is~~
2 ~~filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in~~
3 ~~case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer~~
4 ~~under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the~~
5 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7~~
6 ~~U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the~~
7 ~~date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December~~
8 ~~31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That~~
9 ~~no part of any funds available to the Department, or~~
10 ~~any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting~~
11 ~~a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal~~
12 ~~year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any~~
13 ~~person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled~~
14 ~~"An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved~~
15 ~~August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in~~
16 ~~accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of~~
17 ~~July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or~~
18 ~~attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of~~
19 ~~Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services~~
20 ~~or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a~~
21 ~~Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or~~
22 ~~appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-~~
23 ~~ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*~~
24 ~~*further,* That where farmer participation in the program~~
25 ~~in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full~~

1 ~~amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or~~
2 ~~sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to~~
3 ~~States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have~~
4 ~~not been sufficient to meet such requirements.~~

5 *For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry*
6 *into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the*
7 *Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved*
8 *February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q),*
9 *and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of*
10 *1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the*
11 *provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the*
12 *provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services*
13 *in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the*
14 *preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays*
15 *at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United*
16 *States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December*
17 *31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provi-*
18 *sions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as*
19 *amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,*
20 *pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out*
21 *during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,*
22 *inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the*
23 *total sum provided under this head shall be available during*
24 *the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative*
25 *expenses for carrying out such programs, including the*

1 *peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photo-*
2 *graphs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not*
3 *more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropria-*
4 *tion account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agri-*
5 *cultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That*
6 *payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the*
7 *certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such*
8 *form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried*
9 *out the conservation practice or practices and has complied*
10 *with all other requirements as conditions for such payments*
11 *and that the statements and information contained in the*
12 *application for payment are correct and true, to the best of*
13 *his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of*
14 *March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided*
15 *further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or*
16 *made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural*
17 *Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Num-*
18 *bered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay*
19 *the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees*
20 *or any State or county information employees, but this shall*
21 *not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of*
22 *information to individual farmers: Provided further, That*
23 *such amount shall be available for salaries and other ad-*
24 *ministrative expenses in connection with the formulation and*
25 *administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,-*

1 *000,000, including administration, and formulated on the*
2 *basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments*
3 *and grants among the several States in accordance with*
4 *their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary:*
5 *Provided further, That the proportion allocated to any State*
6 *shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946*
7 *distribution and that no participant shall receive more than*
8 *$500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-con-*
9 *servation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,*
10 *as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjust-*
11 *ment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants*
12 *under such program shall be conditioned upon the utiliza-*
13 *tion of land with respect to which such payments or grants*
14 *are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which*
15 *will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and*
16 *water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective*
17 *manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as*
18 *determined and approved by the State committee appointed*
19 *pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and*
20 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States:*
21 *Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion,*
22 *from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office*
23 *such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-*
24 *penses of said Office in auditing payments under this item:*
25 *Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for*

1 *the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other*
2 *farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and mak-*
3 *ing grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in*
4 *carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary*
5 *in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of*
6 *February 29, 1936, as amended: Provided further, That*
7 *the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments*
8 *to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of*
9 *the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant*
10 *to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and*
11 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary deter-*
12 *mines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the*
13 *United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented*
14 *from filing, applications for payment under any such pro-*
15 *gram during the period the applicable appropriation for*
16 *such program was available for obligation, such payments*
17 *to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropria-*
18 *tion, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources",*
19 *in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946:*
20 *Provided further, That an application for payment on the*
21 *prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person*
22 *entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or in-*
23 *competency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant*
24 *to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,*
25 *as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one*

1 *year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces,*
2 *or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: And provided*
3 *further, That no part of any funds available to the Depart-*
4 *ment, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency*
5 *constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the*
6 *current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel*
7 *expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating*
8 *the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political*
9 *activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who*
10 *has been found in accordance with the provisions of section*
11 *6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have*
12 *violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits*
13 *the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal*
14 *services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner*
15 *a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or*
16 *appropriation by Congress except upon request of any*
17 *Member or through the proper official channels.*

18 SUGAR ACT

19 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
20 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
21 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
22 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of
23 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
24 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)

1 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
2 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

3 ~~NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT~~

4 ~~To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions~~
5 ~~of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public~~
6 ~~Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this~~
7 ~~appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources~~
8 ~~within the States derived from the sale of lunches.~~

9 ~~ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING~~
10 ~~AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS~~

11 ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
12 ~~administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing~~
13 ~~Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), including~~
14 ~~personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.~~

15 MARKETING SERVICES

16 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed ~~$2,~~
17 ~~211,000~~ *$2,286,000* for personal services in the District of
18 Columbia, in conducting investigations, experiments, and
19 demonstrations, as follows:

20 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
21 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
22 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
23 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
24 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy

1 and poultry products *(including broilers)*, fruits and vege-
2 tables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cotton-
3 seed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, ~~$1,527,500~~
4 *$1,566,250.*

5 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
6 tions and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
7 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
8 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,
9 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
10 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when
11 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
12 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
13 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
14 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
15 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
16 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
17 service rendered, $712,000.

18 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
19 among the people of the United States useful information
20 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
21 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
22 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
23 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
24 ards of classification of American farm and food products
25 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as

1 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
2 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
3 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
4 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
5 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
6 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
7 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
8 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and
9 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
10 diem of persons serving without compensation while away
11 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
12 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
13 ~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,100,000: Provided,* That the Secretary may
14 make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Depart-
15 ment such amounts from this appropriation as may be
16 necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropria-
17 tion is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to
18 amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appro-
19 priation items in this Act.

20 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
21 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
22 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
23 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
24 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection
25 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,

1 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
2 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
3 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
4 $1,552,000.

5 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
6 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
7 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
8 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–
9 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
10 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.
11 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
12 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
13 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
14 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
15 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

16 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
17 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
18 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
19 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
20 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
21 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
22 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
23 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-
24 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
25 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

1 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
2 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
3 $1,128,000.

4 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
5 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

6 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
8 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation
9 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
10 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved
11 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
12 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
13 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
14 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
15 Congress.

16 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
17 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
18 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
19 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

20 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
21 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
22 91–99), $41,000.

23 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
24 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
25 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-

1 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
2 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
3 therein, $293,500.

4 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
5 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
6 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
7 $138,000.

8 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

9 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
10 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity
11 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
12 not to exceed ~~$141,000~~ *$153,000* for personal services
13 in the District of Columbia, $530,000.

14 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

15 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
16 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
17 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
18 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
19 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
20 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
21 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

22 Loans: ~~For loans under~~ *Title I and section 43, $20,-*
23 *000,000;* title II, $60,000,000.

24 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the

1 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
2 $1,000,000.

3 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
4 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
5 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
6 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
7 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
8 ~~$18,000,000~~ *$24,000,000.*

9 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
10 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
11 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-
12 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
13 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
14 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
15 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
16 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
17 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
18 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
19 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
20 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
21 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
22 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-
23 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
24 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security

1 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
3 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
4 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
5 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
6 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
7 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
8 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary
9 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
10 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
11 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
12 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of
13 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
14 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
15 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
16 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
17 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
18 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
19 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
20 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
21 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
22 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
23 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

1 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
2 AREAS

3 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
4 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
5 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
6 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
7 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
8 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

11 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
12 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
13 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

14 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-
15 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
16 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
17 financial and credit reports, ~~$4,000,000~~ *$5,000,000.*

18 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
19 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
20 7 thereof, ~~$225,000,000~~ *$250,000,000*, to be borrowed from
21 the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the pro-
22 visions of section 3 (a) of said Act.

23 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act

1 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
2 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:
3 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
4 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
5 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
6 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
7 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
8 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
9 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
10 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
11 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may
12 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
13 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
14 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
15 Electrification Administration established by Executive
16 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid
17 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
18 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
19 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
20 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
21 foregoing provision: *Provided,* That such obligations in-
22 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
23 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
24 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
25 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity

1 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
2 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of
3 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
4 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
5 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
6 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
7 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
8 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
9 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
10 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
11 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the
12 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
13 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
14 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
15 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
16 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
17 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
18 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
19 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
20 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
21 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
22 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
23 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
24 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
25 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions

1 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
2 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-
3 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
4 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
5 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
6 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
7 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
8 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
9 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
10 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is
11 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
12 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
13 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
14 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
15 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
16 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For
17 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
18 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
19 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
20 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
21 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
22 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
23 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
24 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
25 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

1 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
2 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall
3 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
4 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
5 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
6 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
7 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
8 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

9 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses including personal services in
12 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
13 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
14 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
15 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
16 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-
17 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
18 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
19 lower price than to others, payment for which may
20 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
21 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
22 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
23 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
24 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
25 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per

1 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
2 from their homes, without other compensation from the
3 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
4 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
5 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
6 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
7 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
8 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act
9 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
10 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
11 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
12 organizations as provided in said section.

13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
15 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
16 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,
17 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
18 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
19 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
20 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
21 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
22 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
23 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
24 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
25 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary

1 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
2 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-
3 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
4 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
5 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
6 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
7 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
8 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal
9 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
10 association serving the area.

11 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
12 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
13 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
14 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
15 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
16 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-
17 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
18 Department for which appropriations are made under such
19 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
20 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
21 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
22 Budget.

23 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
24 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
25 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-

1 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
2 gency of persons in the field service of the Department
3 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
4 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
5 tural Relations.

6 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
7 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
8 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

9 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
10 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
11 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
12 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
13 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
14 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

15 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
16 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
17 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
18 the United States or who is a member of an organization
19 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
20 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
21 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
22 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
23 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
24 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
25 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to th

1 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
2 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
3 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
4 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
5 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
6 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
7 Government of the United States by force or violence:
8 *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory
9 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
10 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
11 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
12 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
13 *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a
14 strike against the Government of the United States or who
15 is a member of an organization of Government employees
16 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of
17 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
18 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
19 Government of the United States by force or violence
20 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
21 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
22 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
23 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
24 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
25 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in

1 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
2 *vided further,* That nothing in this section shall be con-
3 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
4 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
5 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
6 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
7 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
8 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
9 templated by this section.

10 *Sec. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for*
11 *personal services under appropriations in this Act shall*
12 *not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act*
13 *of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).*

14 Sec. ~~8~~ *9.* This Act may be cited as the "Department of
15 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

16 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

17 Sec. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
18 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
19 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
20 year, namely:

21 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
22 expenses, ~~$1,000,000~~ *$5,000,000,* including not to exceed
23 $700 for newspapers.

24 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
25 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to

1 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop
2 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
3 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
4 $10,000,000.

5 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
6 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
7 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
8 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
9 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
10 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation
11 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
12 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
13 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

14 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
15 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
16 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
17 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
18 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
19 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
20 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for
21 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
22 (including legal and special services performed on a contract
23 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
24 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
25 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property

1 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
2 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
3 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
4 hereof.

5 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
6 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
7 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
8 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
9 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of
10 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
11 cotton, and flax: *Provided further, That none of the funds*
12 *herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or*
13 *subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred*
14 *and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-*
15 *seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of*
16 *the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five*
17 *additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508*
18 *(a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and to-*
19 *bacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not*
20 *to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legis-*
21 *lation.*

22 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
23 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-
24 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
25 plicable to title II of this Act.

1 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

2 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF

3 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

4 Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Pub-
5 lic Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved
6 August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition
7 612 (c)), not more than ~~$40,000,000~~ *$48,000,000* shall
8 be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
9 for use in effectuating the purposes of that Act. *To enable*
10 *the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National*
11 *School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396),*
12 *there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds*
13 *appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the*
14 *Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)),*
15 *such amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limi-*
16 *tation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of*
17 *funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of sec-*
18 *tion 9 of the National School Lunch Act.* The remainder of
19 the fund appropriated by said Act for the fiscal year 1948
20 is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be
21 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury
22 immediately thereafter.

Passed the House of Representatives May 28, 1947.

Attest: JOHN ANDREWS,

*Clerk.*

Calendar No. 493

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

[Report No. 474]

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

MAY 29 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1947

Reported with amendments

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 15, 1947
For actions of July 14, 1947
80th-1st, No. 134

CONTENTS

A.Act.....33
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations.1,2,6,9,14,17
Commendation.....12
Corporations.....2,14
Dairy industry.....15
Fertilizer.....14
Fisheries..... 4
Food control.....10
Foreign affairs.....34,35
Forests and forestry.....21
Housing.....13
Information.....17,36
Lands.....7,16,24
Lands, reclamation.20,25,26
Loans.....29
Loans, farm.....37
Minerals.....21
Peanuts.....33
Personnel.....5,6,8,31
Prices.....11,32
Prices, support.....15
R.F.C.....30
Research.....14,16
School-lunch program..... 9
Soil conservation..9,28,37
Statistics.....19
Strategic materials.....27
Subsidies.....23
Taxation.....3,28
Veterans' benefits.....29
War powers.....16
Wildlife.....18
Wool..... 9

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Government corporations appropriation bill. Sen. Gurney introduced bill to amend Stockpiling Act (probably to reimburse CCC for materials furnished). Rep. Curtis introduced bill to exempt farmers' soil conservation costs from income taxes. House Rules Committee cleared measures to end certain emergency powers, provide for Science Foundation, and transfer Crab Orchard project. House committee reported bill to make specific provision for milk-price support. House received conference report on legislative appropriation bill.

## SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 9016, 9018-27).

Agreed to the following amendments: (1) By Sen. Cooper, Tenn. (for himself and Sens. Cordon and Umstead), to restore $150,000 of the House cut of $300,000 in the OFAR appropriation (pp. 9024-5). (2) By Sen. Saltonstall, Mass., to delete the provision under Research and Marketing Act of 1946 providing "That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof". (3) By Sen. Brooks, Ill. (for the committee), to increase to $758,688 the D. C. salary limitation for salaries and expenses, E&PQ (p. 9024). Otherwise agreed to all committee amendments.

Sens. Brooks, Gurney, Reed, Bushfield, Russell, Hayden, and Tydings were appointed Senate conferees (p. 9026).

2. GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3756, with amendments affecting the Department as follows: Amounts under the provisions of the House bill limiting the amount of assessments to be made against FCA corporations by FCA for supervisory or other services were revised as follows: (a) Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $400,000 (House bill, $275,000; Budget estimate, $421,302); (b) Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, $181,250 (House bill, $125,000; Budget estimate, $296,286); (c) Production Credit Corporations, $232,000 (House bill, $160,000; Budget estimate, $270,017); and (d) Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., $29,000 (House bill, $20,000; Budget estimate, $67,273). No changes were made in the administrative-expense limitations carried in the House bill for these corporations. The Senate Committee deleted all language proposed in Secs. 307

and 308 of the General Provisions as carried in the House bill amending Secs. 104 and 101 of the Government Corporations Control Act, respectively. The Senate bill also contains the following changes in authorizations to purchase passenger vehicles: (a) Federal Intermediate Credit Banks — deletes language authorizing purchase of not over 10 passenger vehicles; and (b) Production Credit Corporations -- decreases the number of vehicles which may be purchased from 15 to 5. (S. Rept. 517; p. 8992.) No change was made in the provision for liquidation of Tenn. Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., by the Treasury Dept.

3. TAXATION. Passed, 60-32, without amendment H. R. 3950, the tax-reduction bill, which is the same as the vetoed bill except for the effective date (pp. 8999-904, 9007-16). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. FISHERIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3598, granting Congress' consent to an interstate compact regarding utilization of Pacific-coast fisheries (S. Rept. 513)(p. 8992).

5. PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures submitted a report showing employment by departments and agencies (pp. 8992-3).

6. APPROPRIATIONS STAFF. The Appropriations Committee submitted a report on the staff of the Committee and their salaries (pp. 8994-5).

7. LANDS. The Public Lands Committee approved (but did not actually report) S.1368, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold (p. D531).

8. PERSONNEL. The Public Lands Committee approved (but did not actually report) H.R. 187, to include air transportation for Federal employees and their families residing in Alaska (p. D531).

9. SOIL CONSERVATION; SCHOOL LUNCH; WOOL. Sen. Williams, Del., inserted tables showing payments to States under the school lunch and agricultural conservation programs as compared to the calculated contributions of the States to these programs, and a similar comparison for the wool price-support program proposed in S. 814 (pp. 9026-7).

10. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Myers, Pa., inserted his statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee in favor of flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations for Pa. (pp. 8996-8).

11. PRICES. Sen. Barkley, Ky., inserted and discussed the President's statement on the probable effects of the settlement of the coal strike on the general price and wage structures (pp. 8995-6).

12. COMMENDATION. Sen. Malone, Nev., and others, commended Sen. Capper (Kans.) for his long career of public service, particularly for his service to agriculture (pp. 9017-8).

13. HOUSING. Sen. Myers, Pa., inserted a letter from a constituent opposing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and his answer to the letter pointing out the advantages of the bill (pp. 8998-9).

Sen. Saltonstall, Mass., spoke in favor of "some general housing legislation" during this session of Congress and inserted a statement on the "Need for Housing in Massachusetts" (p. 9017).

14. GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL (continued). The Senate Committee decreased TVA $4,350,662 below the House figure. Regarding TVA, the Committee

under the Senator's conception, for the full fiscal year the cost of his amendment would be an additional $1,800,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the estimate of the staff of the joint committee, of course I accept it. Their judgment should be better than mine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado tell me just where the additional $300,000,000 comes from?

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the question?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator advise the Senator from Illinois where the additional $300,000,000 comes from? All through the testimony before the Committee on Finance there was no witness from the staff, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or the Treasury Department, who said the loss would exceed more than a billion and a half.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It comes because of the increase in the level of national individual income payments. The Senator before was figuring on an average annual income much lower than we are now figuring on.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand that there would be some difference, but every time we debate the bill wet get a new set of figures on each and every one of the propositions. From the very beginning, from the time we started taking testimony before the Committee on Finance, we got different figures from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, we got different figures from the Treasury Department, we got different figures from every expert who appeared. I presume there was some reason for that, and I accept the reason given.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those figures vary according to the view of what the national individual income payments will be during the fiscal year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is still rather confusing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Flanders | McFarland |
| Baldwin | Fulbright | McGrath |
| Ball | George | McKellar |
| Barkley | Green | McMahon |
| Brewster | Gurney | Magnuson |
| Bricker | Hatch | Malone |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Martin |
| Buck | Hayden | Maybank |
| Bushfield | Hickenlooper | Millikin |
| Butler | Hill | Moore |
| Byrd | Hoey | Morse |
| Cain | Holland | Murray |
| Capehart | Ives | Myers |
| Capper | Jenner | O'Conor |
| Chavez | Johnson, Colo. | O'Daniel |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Cooper | Kem | Overton |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Pepper |
| Donnell | Knowland | Reed |
| Downey | Langer | Revercomb |
| Dworshak | Lodge | Robertson, Va. |
| Eastland | Lucas | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Ecton | McCarran | Russell |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Saltonstall |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Smith |
| Sparkman | Tydings | Wiley |
| Stewart | Umstead | Williams |
| Taft | Vandenberg | Wilson |
| Taylor | Watkins | Young |
| Thomas, Okla. | Wherry | |
| Thye | White | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained on committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—43

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Langer | O'Daniel |
| Brooks | Lodge | Pepper |
| Chavez | Lucas | Revercomb |
| Downey | McCarran | Robertson, Va. |
| Eastland | McClellan | Russell |
| Ferguson | McFarland | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Stewart |
| Green | McKellar | Taylor |
| Hill | McMahon | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hoey | Magnuson | Tydings |
| Holland | Maybank | Umstead |
| Ives | Morse | Watkins |
| Johnson, Colo. | Murray | Wilson |
| Johnston, S. C. | Myers | |
| Kilgore | O'Conor | |

NAYS—47

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Dworshak | Millikin |
| Ball | Ecton | Moore |
| Barkley | Ellender | O'Mahoney |
| Brewster | Flanders | Overton |
| Bricker | George | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Buck | Gurney | Saltonstall |
| Bushfield | Hatch | Smith |
| Butler | Hawkes | Taft |
| Byrd | Hayden | Thye |
| Cain | Hickenlooper | Vandenberg |
| Capehart | Jenner | Wherry |
| Capper | Kem | White |
| Connally | Knowland | Wiley |
| Cooper | McCarthy | Williams |
| Cordon | Malone | Young |
| Donnell | Martin | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Thomas, Utah | Wagner |
| Reed | Tobey | |

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of the debate on the tax bill, an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 9, 1947, which comments upon the abandonment by the Republican leadership in the tax bill of the supposed principles of the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSE SUCCUMBED

One of Oscar Wilde's wisecracks was that the best way to overcome temptation is to succumb to it. Which is what the House did yesterday when it passed the second Knutson bill. On the theory that 49,000,000 taxpayers can't be displeased if $4,000,000,000 is lopped off their income-tax bills, the House plumped for this unstatesmanlike measure by a vote of 302 to 112. That's more than enough to override another Presidential veto.

In his rejection of the first Knutson bill (identical to the present one except that the effective date has been changed from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948), Mr. Truman summed up the arguments against it. Those arguments still hold. Business is booming in the country and needs no spur in the form of lower taxes. Inflation is threatening and to pour $4,000,000,000 into people's pockets will aggravate inflationary pressures. The public debt is astronomically high, and it behooves the country to reduce it while the reducing it good. Vast international commitments are being made and the money has got to be found to honor them.

Under all the circumstances, the wise and strong thing to do is to keep taxes at their present level. But the House, under the leadership of the GOP, saw fit to court the voters and to make hay for the 1948 Presidential year. This kind of opportunism is likely to plague the opportunists. The GOP has long prided itself on its sound fiscal policies, its zeal for budget balancing, and its concern over the public debt. None of these principles was honored in yesterday's performance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 7. Taxation of trailer coaches.

Section 3403 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting after "tractors" the following words: "and except trailer coaches, their furnishings and equipment."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is simply to amend the Revenue Code so as to remove the tax on trailer houses. The tax was imposed on trailer houses at a time when they were considered to be a luxury. The purpose was to discourage their manufacture, and to put the energy and the materials so used into war production. The picture now has entirely changed. Seventy percent of the trailer houses sold last year were sold to veterans. The industry has set aside 60 percent this year for the veterans. The trailer houses are no longer a luxury. They are homes for veterans. Those buying the trailer houses must pay a tax of 7 percent on each trailer house, which amounts to $100, and sometimes up to as high as $200. With homes so scarce and the veterans so hard pressed, I think we could do no better than to remove this

tax on trailer homes which veterans use for homes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. The editorial discusses the bill with relationship to the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETERMINED, BUT BLIND

Like a blind mule with a hot foot, Congress is plunging importunately along toward repassage of the tax-reduction bill, the only change being to make the effective date next January 1 instead of July 1, 1947.

Congress seems determined to try to adjust the Nation's spending to a new tax rate rather than to adjust the tax rate to spending requirements as logic dictates.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 Congress was required by last February 15 to adopt a joint resolution putting a ceiling on Government expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Nearly 5 months after the deadline, Congress still hasn't agreed on how much can be cut from the President's $37,500,000,000 budget and has not adopted a budget resolution. Economy-minded Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has announced quite properly that he will not support a tax reduction until this is done. We hope that enough Senators to sustain another Presidential veto will take the same sound position.

There is another compelling reason for proceeding carefully in fiscal affairs.

On July 12 most of the nations of Europe are expected to gather in Paris to start work on a European recovery plan suggested by Secretary of State Marshall.

Britain and France, who have taken the initiative in European recovery, are in as much haste to survey Europe's needs as Congress is to cut taxes. They can be expected to present us with a plan late in the summer or early in the fall.

Unofficial estimates have been that we will be asked to provide assistance in the sum of five or six billion dollars a year for the next 4 years.

When the recovery plan is presented, Congress will face a momentous decision. It can support Secretary Marshall's suggestion and help Europe get back on its feet in our own national self-interest or it can give world communism a wonderful opportunity to sneer and say, "I told you so."

We need have no doubt that Russian refusal to participate in European recovery is well calculated upon the possibility that we will renege on Secretary Marshall's proposal, thus discrediting this country in the eyes of the world.

To follow through on the Marshall proposal and thus frustrate Russian ambition to control Europe, Congress probably will be asked to spend considerably more than the four billion it expects to save in a tax reduction. Weighing the possibilities in grave decisions ahead, we might yet do well to keep the budget balanced at the present tax rate, with little or nothing left for debt retirement.

We favor a tax reduction in principle. We also support heartily any Government economy that serves the national interest. Unquestionably there is great popular support for strong arguments in favor of relief from burdensome taxes now that the war is over.

But we believe it is the better part of wisdom to proceed cautiously at this time, accumulating as much surplus as possible during a period of prosperity, determining more fully the demands upon our economy before reducing our ability to meet them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—60

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Flanders | O'Daniel |
| Baldwin | George | Reed |
| Ball | Gurney | Revercomb |
| Brewster | Hawkes | Robertson, Va. |
| Bricker | Hickenlooper | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Bridges | Hoey | Saltonstall |
| Brooks | Ives | Smith |
| Buck | Jenner | Stewart |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Butler | Kem | Thye |
| Byrd | Knowland | Tydings |
| Cain | Lodge | Umstead |
| Capehart | McCarran | Vandenberg |
| Capper | McCarthy | Watkins |
| Cooper | McKellar | Wherry |
| Cordon | Malone | White |
| Donnell | Martin | Wiley |
| Dworshak | Millikin | Williams |
| Ecton | Moore | Wilson |
| Ferguson | O'Conor | Young |

NAYS—32

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barkley | Holland | Morse |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Murray |
| Connally | Kilgore | Myers |
| Downey | Langer | O'Mahoney |
| Eastland | Lucas | Overton |
| Ellender | McClellan | Pepper |
| Fulbright | McFarland | Russell |
| Green | McGrath | Sparkman |
| Hatch | McMahon | Taylor |
| Hayden | Magnuson | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hill | Maybank | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas, Utah | Tobey | Wagner |

So the bill (H. R. 3950) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3601, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy in yielding to me. I desire to make a very brief statement, and then to proffer a unanimous consent request. There is on the desk a resolution, Senate Executive Resolution 52, submitted by me several days ago, proposing the discharge of the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Burton N. Behling to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, and providing for the rereference of the nomination to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The question is controversial. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] will agree with me when I say that he and I have discussed this matter back and forth many times in the hope that we might find some adjustment of our differences and avoid bringing the question of committee jurisdiction to the floor of the Senate itself. But we have failed in our efforts, and we have reached the conclusion that our differences are irreconcilable, and that the question can be settled only by the Senate itself.

I desire, first, as in executive session, to ask unanimous consent that when the pending measure, in charge of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], is disposed of the Senate, in executive session, may proceed to the consideration of Senate Executive Resolution 52, which lies on the desk, making that the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what is the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. The resolution proposes to discharge the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, and to refer the nomination to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where nominations of this character have gone from time immemorial, and where jurisdiction has been unchallenged until lately.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I join in the request by the majority leader, that after the pending business is disposed of we proceed, in executive session, to consider the issue raised by the executive resolution now on the table.

I think the Senate ought to know about this case, and the urgency of it. The nomination of Burton N. Behling to be a member of the Federal Power Commission was sent to the Senate by the President on May 5 of this year. It was referred—and I feel properly so, although we shall take that subject up later—to the Committee on Public Works, where it arrived on May 6.

I want the record to show that on May 6, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I wrote to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Power, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], requesting that he proceed at once with hearings upon this nomination. Before such hearings could be had the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], requested me to hold up further proceedings on the nomination, saying that his committee protested the jurisdiction of our committee with respect to the appointment. The counsel for the Committee on Public Works has prepared an extensive brief, and I understand that the counsel for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has also prepared a brief. This matter must be disposed of. We must proceed with hearings promptly, because it would be utterly unfair to the nominee to delay. A decision must be made, and for that reason we must proceed, as I say, promptly to settle the matter of jurisdiction and the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

IMPORTANCE OF HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I earnestly hope that some general housing legislation may be enacted by the Senate before we conclude our work. I realize that time is short. I also realize that writing legislation that will help build more low-cost homes is extremely difficult, but the fact still remains that housing is one of our greatest domestic problems. For that reason, I feel that we should make this genuine effort to encourage more decent housing for our veterans and civilians in the lower-income brackets. I understand perfectly that this problem cannot be overcome by legislation alone. I know there is no magic way to bring down the present high cost of construction and to prevent recurrent shortages of materials. I have received a most interesting statement of the housing problem in Massachusetts from Lewis H. Weinstein, chairman of the State board of housing. These statistics speak for themselves, and I know Massachusetts is not alone in this situation by any means. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include his brief statement on Massachusetts housing needs as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR HOUSING IN MASSACHUSETTS

It is estimated that the families of 50,000 Massachusetts veterans are in desperate need of housing. It is also estimated that there will be a need for about 350,000 new residential units in Massachusetts during the next 10 years.

This pent-up demand is due to numerous factors, most important of which are:

1. Massachusetts population increased 641,000 between 1920 and 1945.

2. There has been a sharp increase in the formation of new families in recent years; the marriage rate in 1946 was almost 2½ times as great as in 1934.

3. In 1940, 40 percent of the existing houses had been built prior to 1899, and it is now estimated that 290,000 units are improper for adequate living.

4. It is estimated that over 80,000 families were doubled-up at the end of 1946.

5. Present estimates call for the construction of 35,000 units a year for the next 10 years, while the yearly average between 1929 and 1946 was less than 7,000 units and the peak year, 1925, only produced about 27,000 units.

Contrasted with these various estimates of need, it is estimated that starts in 1947 will not exceed 12,000 units, and that rental units will approximate no more than 10 percent of the total.

It is estimated that a total of 60,000 veterans in Massachusetts (of which 50,000 are in desperate need) are desirous of buying homes or renting new apartments. Sixty-four percent of those desirous of buying are willing to pay no more than $7,000, while 80 percent of those veterans desirous of renting new quarters can afford no more than $50 a month. The failure of the present building program to satisfy these needs is evident in both the comparatively small number of units which are being built, and in the price range at which units are being placed on the market. The market price of the average sale unit is over $10,000, whereas less than 9 percent of the veterans can afford such a price. A comparison of the percentage range of rental units authorized by the FHA and the expressed needs of the veterans shows even more strikingly the failure to meet veterans' demands, particularly when it is borne in mind that total rental units to be constructed this year will likely equal only 4 percent of the total veterans' demand. The percentage distributions follow:

| Per month | Below $30 | $30 to $40 | $40 to $50 | $50 to $60 | Over $60 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Expressed veteran need | 9.2 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 13.7 | 5.7 |
| FHA permits, first quarter 1947 | .8 | 3.3 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 86.5 |

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR CAPPER ON HIS EIGHTY-SECOND BIRTHDAY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think it both fitting and proper to pause a moment in our work to pay brief tribute to one of our fellow Senators who is serving his twenty-ninth year as United States Senator, and today celebrates his eighty-second birthday.

I refer, as all Senators know, to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], whose constituents have paid their highest tribute to him by their continued reelection of him to the United States Senate since November 5, 1918.

The widespread knowledge of the details of his career makes it presumptuous of me to do more than mention a few in tribute.

ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, was born in Garnett, Kans., July 14, 1865, and was educated in the common schools and high schools of Garnett. He started his career in newspaper work and now owns the third largest newspaper and magazine printing establishment in the United States, known as the Capper Publications.

His election to the United States Senate was preceded by 4 years of elective service as Governor of the great State of Kansas.

His initial election to the United States Senate was the start of a career of service to both the people of Kansas and all the people of our country. The Senator from Kansas has always been regarded as the spokesman of farming interests in the Halls of Congress. The Capper-Volstead Act which legalized farm cooperatives is the basis for every farm cooperative today. The Capper-Ketchem Act, under which the 4-H Clubs were organized and now operate, is a tribute to his interest both in agriculture and in the welfare of children.

The Senator from Kansas has repeatedly demonstrated his love for children, the future citizens and leaders of our country, by his acts even more than by his words. At Christmastime 1920 he founded the Capper Fund for Crippled Children which has grown in its service through the years and constitutes one of his principal hobbies.

Years ago he organized the Capper boy and girl clubs in which he goes into personal partnership with each member of the club, the object of which is the building of character and leadership among farm boys and girls.

Mr. President, in regard to the legislative accomplishments of this man of service, it is enough to say "Look at the record." He has always stood for clean politics, and when the final results of any controversy have been announced, he has immediately and without equivocation given his wholehearted support to the expressed will of the majority.

He is more than a man—he is an institution; a fine, wholesome influence in his State and in his Nation. Mr. President, I am sure I express the sentiment of the Members of this august body when I say to him, "Best wishes and a happy birthday."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add my word to what has been said by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Since I came to the Senate it has been my privilege to be associated with the Senator from Kansas in working for American agriculture and to consider legislation proposed for the benefit of American agriculture. I want to say that I do not think any man living has done more to promote it and to help the farm people of the United States to live a happier and more prosperous life than has the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I ought to take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of the tributes paid to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. They are especially appropriate in that they have been paid immediately preceding the taking by the Senate of the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1948. I want to join my colleagues in paying my deep respect and tribute to the Senator from Kansas, who has long been known as one of the greatest friends of American agriculture.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I can give an over-all picture of the bill rather briefly. The estimate of the Budget Bureau recommended appropriations of $1,188,571,318. The bill as passed by the House carried $847,601,976, or a reduction in the budget estimate of $340,989,342. The Senate bill as reported to the floor at this moment contains an authorization for appropriations of $1,048,266,136, or an increase of $200,664,160 over the bill as it came from the House. The major part of that $200,000,000 is contained in eight specific items.

The first is the item for conservation and use of agricultural land resources. The committee has increased the appropriation for this item by $93,000,000, using $37,000,000 which the Department of Agriculture has as a carry-over from year to year, to be spent in the program for this year. That was the most highly controversial item.

In last year's appropriation bill the Congress authorized a $300,000,000 program for conservation and use for this year. Based upon that authorization, the Department of Agriculture went forward with its program. When the House considered the appropriation bill, it cut back the appropriation for that item from $301,000,000 to $165,000,000, authorizing only $150,000,000 to be used as payments and $15,000,000 to be used for administrative purposes. The Senate committee believed it was its duty to follow through with the program which was authorized by both figure and language in the 1947 Appropriation Act, and therefore the committee voted to reinstate the full payments of $267,500,000, reducing the appropriations for expenses, however, to $27,500,000, or making a total of $295,000,000.

Moreover, the House had eliminated any authorization for any program for the ensuing year. The Senate committee voted to revive that program and to authorize a $150,000,000 program for the fiscal year 1948, but the committee changed the procedure. Believing that the soil-conservation program should be utilized as an incentive, the committee is of the opinion that those who can afford to pay for their own soil-conservation programs in large amounts should be required to do so. So in the authorization for next year the committee has provided that no participant shall receive more than $500 in payments for participating in this program with the Government of the United States. The present limitation is $10,000. So the committee has voted to reduce it by $9,500 to the participants so that more of the smaller participants and those in the lower income groups on the farms may participate and may have the incentive which we believe this program will provide.

The second item was that for the Farmers Home Administration. As to that item, the House eliminated entirely the $35,000,000 estimated by the Bureau of the Budget for tenant loans. There are a great many veterans as well as other persons, who have applied for loans. But because of the rising cost of land, the President's own concern about it, in calling a special meeting to consider ways and means of stopping the inflationary rise in the cost of land, and believing that many veterans might—unless the administration screens each case carefully—be loaded down with land that will prove to be not beneficial to them, if a time of low prices comes, as we believe it inevitably will, we did not restore the full $35,000,000 of the Budget Bureau's estimate; nevertheless, by unanimous vote in both the subcommittee and the full committee, we restored $20,000,000 for the item for loans, and added $6,000,000 to the item for salaries and administrative expenses, making a total addition of $26,000,000 over the amounts allowed by the House.

For the Rural Electrification Administration, the appropriation for loans was reduced by the House to $225,000,000, and the appropriation for administrative expenses was reduced by the House by $1,600,000. The subcommittee and the full Senate Appropriations Committee restored $25,000,000 to the appropriation for loans, making a total of $250,000,000, and restored $1,000,000 for the appropriation for administrative expenses; and in the report the committee suggests that this appropriation be devoted to the areas where at the present time there is less opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the REA.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to congratulate the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], for restoring the cuts made by the House of Representatives in the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. I congratulate the committee because I think its action is to be commended, and I think the appropriation as recommended by our committee will prove to be most beneficial.

On page 12 of the report there is a statement which I should like to have clarified at this time. It appears at the top of the page, as follows:

> The committee instructs the Administrator of REA to report to both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees in writing 30 days in advance of approving allocations of funds for acquiring or building generating plants.

I can see no objection to that instruction at a time when the Congress is in session, but I should like to ask whether it would apply under certain conditions which I shall describe. For instance, there is an REA system in my own State. At the present time it is purchasing power from one of the corporate power companies. But that company itself is so desperately short of power that it may have to cut off the supply of power to the REA, and it has said so in so many words; and it has also provided in the contract that in the event that it becomes too short of power, it may cut off the supply to the REA.

The REA itself has a small Diesel generating plant which would be totally inadequate to supply its members in case the other source of power is lost. If that source of power is lost, it probably will happen during the coming fall, during the period of low water, when Congress is not in session. In such event it would be almost necessary for the REA cooperative to add to its generating equipment on short notice.

Would the Senator from Illinois expect that this instruction to the REA would hold under such conditions at a time when the Senate was not in session, or would a notice to the committee clerk that a loan was to be made for the purpose of the installation of the generating equipment suffice, even though the Senate were not in session?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I speak only for myself. I wish to tell the Senator from Vermont that there was considerable feeling that something on the subject should be written into the law, and offer was made of an amendment which would prohibit the REA from building or acquiring any generating plants without first going to the State authority, after the determination had been made as to the necessity of supplying additional power at a reasonable rate. The committee felt that such a provision should not be placed in the bill, but that we would have a better understanding of how far the REA was to go, and would have a chance of being notified of any acquisition or building of a generating plant, by requiring that 30 days' notice be given by them.

If the REA in the Senator's State can foresee such a situation, I think it should report it 30 days in advance. Certainly it can foresee 30 days in advance what its problem is going to be.

In view of the shortage of generating equipment, which is one of the bottlenecks all over the United States, we did not provide that they could not do it, but we simply say that we wish to be notified 30 days before they do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the purpose, and I do not disagree with it. I was simply bringing up the possibility that an emergency might arise. For instance, we lost a substantial source of power in Vermont. the other day, when

a dam burst. That power is very badly needed. The bursting of that dam will make our very short supply of power still shorter.

In the event of the occurrence of such an emergency, when it is necessary to get power somewhere very quickly, is it the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the committee would have objection to the installation of such generating equipment, even though the Congress was not in session; and would a notice to the committee clerk, who will be in Washington, we assume, meet the requirements of this instruction of the committee?

Mr. BROOKS. I think a notice to the clerk, addressed to the chairman of the committee, will be adequate notice. It is not stated that it has to be delivered in hand. There will be somebody here, and he can be notified. It is merely for the purpose of having a better understanding, and some notice, of when they are going to build generating plants. I think the provision could hardly be more liberal.

Mr. AIKEN. Notice to the clerk of the committee would suffice?

Mr. BROOKS. Notice addressed to the chairman.

Mr. AIKEN. I am satisfied with the statement of the Senator from Illinois. I am speaking of a very possible emergency which may occur in my State, and it would have to be met in some way.

Mr. BROOKS. The next item, Mr. President, relates to the school-lunch program. Last year the Federal Government provided $81,000,000 toward this program. The Budget Bureau's estimate this year was $75,000,000. The House reduced it to $45,000,00, and eliminated the possibility of the practice which has been followed in the past, of considering the money that is paid in by school children for their lunch as a part of the matching fund. The Senate committee has restored the full $75,000,000, and deleted the restriction against the use of the payments by the children for their lunches as a part of the matching fund. We did suggest, in our report, however, that we felt that the States might move faster in assuming their rightful share in caring for this program.

The House pointed out that almost every State government today has a very large surplus, while the Federal Government is operating under a deficit of $257,000,000,000. I might say that it was my purpose, as the chairman of the subcommittee, to suggest to various witnesses who came before us, parent-teacher associations and others, that they use diligence, and all their influence, to try to impress on local government—county, city, and State—that they should assume a large proportion of this very beneficial program. Because only 22 States had by legislative authority authorized or appropriated money for this purpose, and 26 States had not, we felt that the program should be continued. I might say, further, that in my own State more than a year ago I urged the chief advocates of the program to go to the State government, which they did, and they received a larger appropriation than they ever received before.

I believe the program is a beneficial one, but I think we should take account of the fiscal condition of the Federal Government. As was pointed out in the debate in the House, we are giving billions of dollars to feed the children of Europe; and it was made plain that that is a responsibility which falls on the Federal Treasury, and that a larger proportion of this program should be assumed by the local governments.

The next item is section 32 funds. The House allowed only $40,000,000; the Senate committee increased the amount to $48,000,000 which will, we are told by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, meet any foreseeable problem in meeting the obligations for the purpose for which section 32 funds were originally set aside, and with the $8,000,000 additional, they will be given 4 percent of the $48,000,000, which will give them an adequate fund for the administration of the agricultural marketing program.

Another item of $6,140,000 pertains to meat inspection. The House provided $5,000,000, and suggested that it be a revolving fund, that the packers from now on should pay all the costs, by fee, of meat inspection. There was much objection to that in the Senate committee, on the ground that meat inspection is a public health measure. It was provided for by law with that in mind. Seventy-five percent of the meat of the country today which is slaughtered is Federally inspected. That percentage has grown during the war, but a great many more packing plants have come in under meat inspection. Six hundred and fifty were participating before the war, and 900 are now participating, showing that a greater number of plants have come in, and therefore, with the feeling that the meat inspection might be done away with, or avoided, by different packing companies, thereby endangering the health of the country, if the cost were imposed as a fee, and that the expense would be put back on the consumer, the amount of $6,140,000 was restored.

The next item is Federal crop insurance. The House reduced the amount from $9,000,000 and a little more to $1,000,000. Since that time the Senate has passed a bill, whose author is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and in the House there have been hearings on a similar bill. We have increased the amount by four or five million dollars, and put the crop insurance on an experimental basis.

With the million dollars allowed by the House, the Department would not be able even to collect the premiums this year. There are some 540,000 contracts in force now, some fifty-one or fifty-two millions in premiums outstanding, with a possible insurable loss of $500,000,000. We felt that adequate funds should be provided to service those loans, to collect those premiums, to service the losses as they were reported, and to place the new Federal Crop Insurance project on a strictly experimental stage, so that it might become a sound program, and then extend it on that basis.

The other amount of $4,000,000 that was restored was in the item of forest roads and trails.

With this explanation, Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order has already been made. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Illionis [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of agricultural appropriations, for his great service to agriculture. I think his understanding of and sympathy with agricultural problems merit commendation. His tolerance and patience through many days of hearings are to be commended also. The chairman's job was not an easy one. It was his difficult task to reconcile and bring together those on the committee who favored curtailed appropriations for farm programs and those, like myself, whose business has always been farming, who strongly favored strong and adequately-financed farm programs. I think he did a very excellent job, indeed.

I am very happy at the result of the hearings in the subcommittee. I believe they represent great gains for agriculture, which would have been lost if the House action had been allowed to stand.

At this point in my remarks I ask to have inserted in the RECORD Wayne Darrow's Washington Farm Letter, which gives a very good review of agricultural appropriations as set forth in the committee bill now before the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

The more-liberal-than-the-House farm appropriations bill reported today by Senate Appropriations Committee will clear the Senate late next week with little change.

Senator BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, chairman of farm subcommittee, has made as sure as he can that no floor amendments will be pushed, and that many House GOP Members will go along when bill gets there. YOUNG, Republican, North Dakota, led fight in committee for restorations, helped by RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia.

TABER, Republican, New York, and DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, will put up a fight to keep many of the original cuts when bill comes back to House. Our check-up indicates they will lose more than they will win, and that final bill will be much nearer Senate than House bill.

Here are high lights of Senate bill, compared to House:

AAA: Full conservation payment funds for 1947, or $130,000,000 over House figure, and $27,500,000 for administration (nearly twice what House allowed); $150,000,000 for 1948, with limit of $500 on individual payments, and allocations to States on basis of conservation needs except no State can be reduced more than 15 percent below the 1946 distribution.

SCS: Soil conservation research funds restored to full budget request by adding $750,000 to House allowance.

FHA: Tenant-purchase loans of $20,000,000, with priority recommended for veterans; $6,000,000 more administrative funds. This is $20,000,000 more than allowed by the House.

School lunches: Full $75,000,000 restored, to come from section 32 funds (tariff revenues), and prohibition removed against use of school-children payments as offsets to Federal funds. This is $30,000,000 more than the House figure.

Section 32 funds: Upper from $40,000,000 allowed by House to $48,000,000 for surplus purchases, and $75,000,000 for lunches.

REA: Full $250,000,000 loan power restored and $1,000,000 replaced in administrative funds. Empty provision: Senate and House Appropriations Committees must be notified 30 days in advance of any generating-plant expansion.

Market research: Hope-Flannagan funds upped from $9,000,000 to $9,500,000, with suggestion USDA set up separate unit to handle.

Meat inspection: Full funds restored—packers not to pay cost.

Crop insurance raised from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000. BAE got $500,000 restored for economic investigations. Home economics cut $245,000 below House. Solicitor's office had $200,000 restored.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to touch on one or two of the accomplishments of the Senate committee. One is the restoration of the PMA conservation and land-use program for next year. In my opinion that is the major accomplishment of our committee's work. In fact, I cannot see how any future agricultural program can be written and made effective without the machinery provided by the committee system now in use under the present conservation and land-use program. There must be a farmer-committee system functioning if any sound agricultural program is to be really effective.

In my opinion, it would have been desirable to provide for the 1948 program on a scale larger than the $150,000,000 program set forth here; but in the interests of economy there was some justification for this reduction and a substantial program can still be carried forward under this figure.

Another great and important accomplishment was the restoration of the section 32 funds, which are badly needed in the support of farm prices. It should be noted that the committee restored $8,000,000 in section 32 funds for the support of farm prices and otherwise fully provided for farm-support prices.

The restoration of $25,000,000 in REA loan funds is very important to many areas of the United States, and particularly in my State which now has the lowest percentage of electrified farms of all the States of the Nation.

It was absolutely necessary that crop insurance administration funds be restored if this program is to operate successfully. There are some appropriations in which I would rather have seen larger restorations than are made in this bill, but I believe that the committee action, as a whole, is very favorable. I hope the Senate will adopt the action of the committee without major amendment.

I had been hopeful of a larger raise in loan funds for the Farmers Home Administration, which gives valuable service to farmers generally and particularly to farmer veterans. However, the $20,000,000 increase granted by the committee will be very helpful, as will the substantial increase in administrative funds.

The restoration of $25,000,000 in REA loan funds also was a commendable action on the part of the committee, although I would have preferred a larger restoration of funds for REA administrative needs than the $1,000,000 allowed.

There is one further amendment to which I would like to refer very briefly. In restoring the conservation and land-use program for next year on a basis of $150,000,000, an amendment was adopted placing this program on a basis of need. The ceiling limiting to $10,000 the maximum payment which can be made to any one farmer under the present program was changed so that the ceiling will be $500 under the 1948 program. On the over-all picture for the United States there would be no material change in the amount of money going to the various States as a result of this amendment, with the exception of three or four States. Kansas, under a $300,000,000 program, would have had its funds under this program reduced from approximately $10,000,000 to $5,000,000. North Dakota's share would have been reduced from $7,726,000 to $3,758,000. The amendment that I offered to the committee, which was accepted, prohibits a change of more than 15 percent from last year's figures. The effect of this amendment of mine is to prevent a loss of $2,809,000 to North Dakota farmers in payments under this year's program and a possible loss of $1,404,550 to them under next year's program as set forth in this bill. This, I believe, makes the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to make grants on the basis of need, workable and will make possible a good program for next year, even with the more limited funds. I hope that the final action on these agricultural appropriations will remain substantially as left by our committee. The important place agriculture occupies in our national economy makes absolutely necessary all of these funds if we are to prevent another bankrupt agriculture such as that which followed the last war.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the vote on the amendments, I would like to say just a word. The subject of American agriculture is very close to my heart, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the junior Senator from Illinois and the members of his subcommittee on the very excellent work they have done in connection with this bill. I consider it perfectly fair and generous treatment of American agriculture. I want to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] for his excellent leadership on the Agriculture appropriation bill.

Now that this seems to be a day of compliments and congratulations, Senators having just now congratulated one of our colleagues on his birthday after 30 years of service in this body, I wish to say a word about the work of one of our colleagues who has been here only a comparatively short time. I refer to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I have been associated with him since he has been here. I want to say that his work on the Committee on Agriculture, as well as on the Committee on Appropriations, has been most outstanding. He has been diligent in his attendance at committee hearings. He has studied the bills thoroughly, and he has been fair not only to agriculture but to all other groups of people as well. I know of no one who has made a greater contribution to constructive agricultural legislation in so short a time as has Senator YOUNG. I am glad to take this opportunity to say what I think about his work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to take a brief moment to express my gratitude to the Committee on Agriculture for the improvements they have made in the situation confronting the agricultural appropriation bill. I was very much discouraged, I will say frankly, when the House of Representatives, for whom I have the highest respect, having served in it for a long time, got through with the agricultural appropriation bill, especially in view of what it did to the Rural Electrification Administration, soil conservation, the Farmers Home Administration, and certain other items of the appropriation bill. I naturally am interested especially in those items which are the basis of our improved agricultural situation, because I was here when the original legislation providing for them was enacted and when we set out to try to stop the ravages of soil erosion in the United States, which takes millions of acres of rich surface soil down our creeks and rivers, and into the oceans and gulfs every year. I have always felt, and I am sure every other Senator will agree, that as our population increases, every acre of land must support more people than it did before. We cannot allow our soil to become wasted. We must not only retain its fertility, but we must reclaim large areas which in the early days were allowed to go to waste because it was not needed. So it is encouraging to see the Senate committee restore substantially the funds which we felt were absolutely indispensable to carry on the soil conservation program.

The same thing applies to the REA. We know that under its administration of the funds loaned to it, millions of our farmers, farmers' wives, and children have had lifted from their backs the drudgery of hard hand labor. It is one of the things in which the States and local communities could not indulge. It had to come through the loaning power of the Federal Government. It could not have been done even by commercial banks and lending agencies. In that view of that important situation, which has found encouragement in all States of the Union by the formation of REA cooperatives and by improved conditions in all the homes in the country, although they are not yet all electrified, the increase since the inauguration of the program has justified the effort on the part of the Federal Government, in my judgment, and I think it has met with the general approval of the people, especially of the farmers throughout the country.

In regard to the Farmers Home Administration, which was originally known as the Resettlement Administration and then the Farm Security Administration, I believe, all Senators recognize that the object was to make it possible for more American farmers to own their own homes, to hold out encouragement and assistance to tenant farmers to become land owners and home owners. We know that the larger the proportion of our farmers who own their homes, the greater the number of farmers who have a stake in the soil which they cultivate,

the more stable our institutions will be. Foreign ideologies and nostrums find little welcome and little fertility in the soil of farmers who own their land and their homes, and who cultivate their own land. It is the hopelessness and despair of the tenant who, looking down the dim corridors of the future, can see no chance of owning his own farm and his own home, that offers opportunity for instability and insecurity, which is the feeding ground of foreign nostrums of which we speak so much in this day.

I want to express my own appreciation to the committee for improving the situation so far as the appropriation is concerned. I hope the increases that have been provided in the bill will be retained when the bill goes to conference. I want to thank all the members of the committee for the assistance they have rendered in that respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Penalty mail," on page 4, line 4, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "$3,186,000" and insert "$3,486,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 4, line 19, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and make a part of the appropriation 'Research on agricultural problems of Alaska,' without matching requirement"; and in line 23, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso "*Provided*, That section 11 of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said act of August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out 'authorized to be appropriated under section 9 (a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a).'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 14, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 15, after the words "In all", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor," on page 6, line 9, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,025,000" and insert "$2,225,000", and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,597,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Printing and binding," on page 10, line 20, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608C 608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection therewith" and insert "to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32"; and on page 11, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,300" and insert "$170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 11, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,887,000" and insert "$2,387,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8 ,after the word "trends", to strike out "$1,743,600" and insert "$2,243,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration—Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 18, after line 9, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary, through such officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Territory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska $144,940, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and with other public and private agencies. The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities hereunder. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than any land in general use heretofore for other university purposes, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable continue the employment of the existing personnel of the station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended balances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature or acquired under authority of law for the construction, use, and development of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Parnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related acts: Hatch Act, the act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377, 379), $720,000; Adams Act, the act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373, 376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f); relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 14, to insert:

To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to insert:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C., 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,663,708; Hawaii, the act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the act approved

February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500; Puerto Rico, the act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20 1936 and acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 24, line 4, before the word "for", to strike out "$1,059,000" and insert "$1,061,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 7, after the word "products", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$11,140,000"; and in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the 'Meat inspection fund,' which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative, statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the word "animals", to strike out "$290,000" and insert "$340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry", on page 29, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$540,912."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering—Salaries and expenses", on page 31, line 20, after the word "control", to strike out "$359,280" and insert "$379,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "management", to strike out "$1,391,000" and insert "$1,491,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses", on page 34, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$692,000" and insert "$709,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 14, after the numerals "166", to strike out "$2,697,100" and insert "$3,047,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics", on page 39, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$381,700" and insert "$305,000", and in line 24, after the word "subject", to strike out "$1,045,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 40, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,055,378" and insert "$1,083,378."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 6, after the word "forests", to strike out "$23,764,891" and insert "$24,014,891."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 3, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 8, after "section 10", to strike out "$572,000" and insert "$822,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests," on page 46, line 19, after the numerals "521", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000"; in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired"; and in line 21, after the amendment last above stated, to insert a semicolon and "the administrative cost of such acquisition to be met from the appropriation 'National Forest Protection and Management'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails," on page 47, line 25, after "(1)", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$11,000,000"; in line 26, after "(2)", to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$8,300,000"; on page 48, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "$15,300,000" and insert "$19,300,000"; and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$109,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Flood control," on page 48, line 23, after the word "improvement", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,500,000"; on page 49, line 5, after the word "situated", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 12, after the amendment just above stated, insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service," on page 49, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$838,500" and insert "$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 5, after the word "installations", to strike out "$673,000" and insert "$1,423,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 52, after line 4, to strike out:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of

sections 7 to 71, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 203, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938"; *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation or administration of any 1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to marketing quotas under the latter act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That where farmer participation in the program in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet such requirements.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 26, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1385)) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used

in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 2, to strike out:

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 8, to strike out:

ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 ( U. S. C. 608c–608d), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services," on page 61, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,211,000" and insert "$2,286,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 1, after the word "products", to insert "(including broilers)"; and in line 3, after the word "products", to strike out "$1,527,500" and insert "$1,566,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commodity Exchange Authority," on page 66, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$141,000" and insert "$153,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farmers Home Administration," on page 66, line 22, after the word "Loans", to strike out "For loans under" and insert "Title I and section 43, $20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 8, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$24,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," on page 69, line 17, after the word "reports", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 20, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 78, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 14, to change the section number from 8 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Government corporations," on page 78, line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 11, after the word "flax", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed 633 counties and flax in not to exceed 87 counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed 50 counties each and cotton in not to exceed 56 counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Reduction in appropriation—Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," on page 81, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$48,000,000"; and in line 9, after the word "act", to insert "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 34, line 3, was agreed to; so I may offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKS. I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 34, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$709,440" and insert in lieu thereof "$758,688."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$428,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$578,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], my colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], it was the understanding that the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from North Carolina, and I would join in the amendment, which we are glad to do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to say that the amendment which I offered and sent to the desk carries on its face the names of the senior Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and myself. I wish the clerk would read the amendment, including the sponsors.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to associate myself in the offering of the amendment, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], with whom we have discussed this matter, desire to be associated with it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the wording of the amendment as it was sent to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The wording of the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. UMSTEAD) to the bill H. R. 3601, viz, on page 13, line 13, strike out "$428,000" and insert in its place "$578,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me explanatory of the amendment just offered.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the distinguished senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], in the amendment to increase the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations by $150,000, from $428,000 to $578,000.

The proposed reduction in funds of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

would have required the Department of Agriculture to surrender to the State Department the vital job of protecting American farmers' interests in the forthcoming battle for our fair share of agricultural exports. This is the very thing the House Appropriations Committee said it wanted to prevent.

Practically every foreign government now imposes controls over trade which restrict the chances of American producers to export their surplus farm products. The best way to remedy this situation is to bargain directly with other countries and to negotiate in international conferences and international organizations. American farmers need an export market.

If this section of the Department of Agriculture is made weaker, the State Department must step in to fill the vacuum. Farmers prefer to be represented through their own Department. Farmers want representation which knows the facts on the world agricultural situation, and the domestic agricultural situation. It is the only kind of representation which can be effective.

Furthermore, it is necessary that farmers, farm organizations, and farm leaders have the facts about competitive production and about market opportunities and market conditions abroad. They want those facts made available to them through our Department of Agriculture.

The proposed reduction in funds for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations will cripple these vital services to American agriculture at the very time when they are most needed.

If this cut is sustained, the Department of Agriculture will no longer be able to provide experienced men to represent farm interests in these international negotiations, now more important than ever before.

Furthermore, such representation as will remain will not have at its command the detailed facts on the agriculture of other countries and the analyses of the world agricultural situation which are essential to success in the job of protecting American farmers' interests.

And just as important, American farmers, agricultural producers' organizations, and American exporters will not have the information which they need, in the form of summarized reports and analyses of production, competition, and market opportunities abroad.

This is particularly true for my own State of Kentucky, whose chief crop in value is tobacco. Export outlets are absolutely necessary for tobacco producers. Already the Office of Foreign Agriultural Relations has performed notable service in finding new markets for Kentucky tobacco, and it looks forward to increased aid and service on its part to the farmers of the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a brief memorandum of two pages with reference to the services of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations to the producers of tobacco throughout the United States in undertaking to facilitate the securing of foreign markets for this particular agricultural product throughout the world, wherever they are available.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECT SERVICES TO TOBACCO GROWERS AND EXPORTERS

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations renders many services, direct and indirect, to tobacco growers and exporters. Three instances will illustrate: the Czechoslovakian loan for the purchase of American tobacco, the Italian loan for the purchase of American tobacco, and the issuance of licenses for importation of American tobacco into China.

THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN LOAN FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES LEAF TOBACCO

Reports from the American Embassy, Praha, Czechoslovakia, indicated that the tobacco monopoly of that country wished to purchase American leaf tobacco for the manufacture of American-type blended cigarettes and other products. The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations supplied information regarding our tobacco to the Czechoslovak Embassy which led to a loan by the Export-Import Bank to the Czechoslovak Government of $2,000,000 in September 1946. Since that time we have shipped to Czechoslovakia more than 4,000,000 pounds of tobacco made up as follows: Burley 1,534,000 pounds, flue-cured 1,938,000 pounds, Virginia fire-cured 559,000 pounds, and cigar 52,000 pounds. This is the largest amount of tobacco ever shipped to that country in 1 year. But for the recent unfortunate circumstances, a profitable market would have been established for American tobacco in Czechoslovakia. It may yet result if conditions again become favorable to trade relations with that country.

THE ITALIAN LOAN FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES LEAF TOBACCO

Report No. 312 of November 30, 1945, from the American Embassy at Rome gave a concise statement of the tobacco situation in Italy. It was noted that stocks of leaf tobacco on June 30, 1945, amounted to only 44,600,000 pounds as compared with 244,500,000 pounds on the same date in 1939. This indicated a serious shortage of tobacco and the need for additional supplies. The United States at one time had supplied Italy with the bulk of its requirements and it was thought that the situation might lead to the reestablishement of trade with that country.

The Office arranged for a conference with the commercial counselor of the Italian Embassy and the situation was discussed. It was found that the Italian Monopoly wished to purchase tobacco in this country but had insufficient dollars for this purpose. After several conferences between officials of the Embassy and this office, the Italian tobacco monopoly decided to apply to the Export-Import Bank for a loan to purchase tobacco. At this point it was thought best to place further negotiations in the hands of the trade, and a conference was arranged for the Export Committee of the Tobacco Association of the United States to discuss the matter with officials of the Italian Embassy. The conference took place on July 12, 1946, and there were several subsequent conferences. The final result was a loan by the Export-Import Bank of $5,000,000 to the Italian tobacco monopoly for the purchase of American tobacco.

Through May of this year we had exported to Italy 7,632,000 pounds of tobacco made up as follows: Burley 5,528,000 pounds, fire-cured 1,471,000 pounds, flue-cured 630,000 pounds, and black fat (a processed tobacco) 3,287 pounds. The tobacco trade between the United States and Italy was thereby reestablished, and it is expected that Italy will continue to be a market of importance for our tobacco.

THE CHINESE SITUATION

The Chinese Government was, and still is, short of dollar exchange when hostilities with Japan ceased. The Government of China decided that certain goods and commodities, absolute essentials, could be imported freely; certain others, nonessentials and luxuries, were prohibited; and a third class, including leaf tobacco, could be imported only by permit and that permits would be allocated.

This action by the Chinese Government was condemned by flue-cured tobacco growers and exporters. They passed several strongly worded resolutions and wrote letters of protest to Members of Congress. This office was requested to call a conference of growers and exporters to discuss the situation. A conference was called by a farm organization (North Carolina State Grange) for April 17, 1946.

The situation in China was explained as regards both the financial situation and the basis to be used in allocating licenses for the imports of leaf tobacco. Tobacco growers and exporters were advised to wait until licenses were allocated before taking any definite action, as until licenses were issued there was no basis for a protest. They agreed to this procedure, but drafted resolutions which were forwarded to the Department of State. That Department cabled the United States officials in China certain views expressed in the resolutions sent to the State Department.

On June 13, 1947, the Department of State received from Shanghai, China, a cable which stated:

"All American dealers leaf tobacco here have received authorization to import quantities and values of American leaf tobacco as applied for covering March–September, 7 months' period."

It, therefore, paid to wait out the situation rather than lodge formal complaint before we had full information. Exports to China in 1946 amounted to 72,900,000 pounds.

The statement has been made that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is tied too closely to the Department of State. The instances cited indicate that close cooperation between the two agencies is desirable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 6, to strike out the proviso which reads:

*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

I will say very briefly that this provision, which was put into the appropriation bill this year, would eliminate the opportunity to carry out the purposes of the act of 1946 to treat fish and shellfish as agricultural products in connection with transportation rates, and matters of that kind. There is no money involved. The striking out of the language would simply allow the Department of Agriculture to include fish and shellfish as agricultural products in connection with rates on the railroads and similar matters. I hope the Senator from Illinois will be able to accept the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, we had no testimony on this item. It was not mentioned, and we did not know there would be any controversy about it. I will accept the amendment, with the understanding that it has to do only with giving fish and shellfish the benefit of freight rates. If however it will include fish and shellfish as a part of the program for support prices for agriculture, I shall certainly object, if I find that to be a fact in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not understand that to be the situation, and if there is anything of that character, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3601) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we have just passed an appropriation bill containing appropriations which exceed those of last year by a little more than $20,000,000. I shall not make any extended remarks at this time. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of tables which show the distribution of some of these funds during the past 12 months.

The first is a table which shows the distribution by States in connection with the wool program. This chart is based upon a loss of 10 cents a pound, which was estimated by the Department of Agriculture. It shows how much each State will contribute toward the payment of this bill, and also how much each State will receive. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re Senate bill 814, to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, based on loss of 10 cents per pound*

| | Proportional part of— | |
|---|---|---|
| | Amount to be paid | Amount to be received |
| Alabama | $188,800 | $11,300 |
| Arizona | 60,800 | 352,100 |
| Arkansas | 80,000 | 35,600 |
| California | 2,662,400 | 2,040,800 |
| Colorado | 192,000 | 1,337,200 |
| Connecticut | 553,600 | 3,600 |
| Delaware | 316,800 | 1,300 |
| Florida | 310,400 | 6,100 |
| Georgia | 320,000 | 6,000 |
| Idaho | 48,000 | 1,182,500 |
| Illinois | 2,800,000 | 518,900 |
| Indiana | 723,200 | 364,800 |
| Iowa | 252,800 | 855,700 |
| Kansas | 307,200 | 513,100 |
| Kentucky | 560,000 | 434,200 |
| Louisiana | 272,000 | 71,900 |
| Maine | 105,600 | 20,500 |

*Re Senate bill 814, to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, based on loss of 10 cents per pound*—Continued

| | Proportional part of— | |
|---|---|---|
| | Amount to be paid | Amount to be received |
| Maryland | $569,600 | $28,100 |
| Massachusetts | 1,145,600 | 4,200 |
| Michigan | 1,555,200 | 500,100 |
| Minnesota | 473,600 | 701,500 |
| Mississippi | 73,600 | 19,400 |
| Missouri | 860,800 | 861,900 |
| Montana | 48,000 | 2,395,800 |
| Nebraska | 220,800 | 272,400 |
| Nevada | 28,800 | 454,000 |
| New Hampshire | 60,800 | 4,800 |
| New Jersey | 1,004,800 | 3,800 |
| New Mexico | 35,200 | 1,379,700 |
| New York | 6,412,800 | 170,400 |
| North Carolina | 864,000 | 22,400 |
| North Dakota | 35,200 | 622,600 |
| Ohio | 2,044,800 | 1,195,600 |
| Oklahoma | 230,400 | 185,100 |
| Oregon | 217,600 | 838,700 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,531,200 | 209,500 |
| Rhode Island | 179,200 | 1,200 |
| South Carolina | 144,000 | 2,000 |
| South Dakota | 35,200 | 1,108,700 |
| Tennessee | 256,000 | 179,000 |
| Texas | 848,000 | 7,915,100 |
| Utah | 64,000 | 1,790,100 |
| Vermont | 35,200 | 10,200 |
| Virginia | 595,200 | 153,500 |
| Washington | 428,800 | 343,800 |
| West Virginia | 153,600 | 166,800 |
| Wisconsin | 665,600 | 242,600 |
| Wyoming | 25,600 | 2,563,100 |
| Total | 31,596,800 | 32,101,700 |

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also have a table showing the distribution in connection with the school-lunch program, of the $55,000,000 which was distributed among the States last year. This table is broken down by States. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re Public Law 396, 79th Cong., school-lunch program—Table showing the amount contributed by each State toward the school-lunch program (according to Federal income-tax percentages), and the amount apportioned to each State by the Federal Government for this program, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1946*

| State | Proportional part of— | | Increase or decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount paid | Amount received | |
| Alabama | $324,500 | $1,996,954 | Increase. |
| Arizona | 104,500 | 309,976 | Do. |
| Arkansas | 137,500 | 1,361,384 | Do. |
| California | 4,576,000 | 2,182,698 | Decrease. |
| Colorado | 330,000 | 381,089 | Increase. |
| Connecticut | 951,500 | 327,070 | Decrease. |
| Delaware | 544,500 | 207,700 | Do. |
| Florida | 533,500 | 1,203,813 | Increase. |
| Georgia | 550,000 | 2,787,875 | Do. |
| Idaho | 82,500 | 279,219 | Do. |
| Illinois | 4,812,500 | 2,713,592 | Decrease. |
| Indiana | 1,243,000 | 1,173,258 | Do. |
| Iowa | 434,500 | 855,413 | Increase. |
| Kansas | 528,000 | 541,786 | Do. |
| Kentucky | 962,500 | 1,385,763 | Do. |
| Louisiana | 467,500 | 1,872,104 | Do. |
| Maine | 181,500 | 260,476 | Do. |
| Maryland | 979,000 | 364,851 | Decrease. |
| Massachusetts | 1,969,000 | 1,099,187 | Do. |
| Michigan | 2,673,000 | 1,658,016 | Do. |
| Minnesota | 814,000 | 1,185,193 | Increase |
| Mississippi | 126,500 | 1,240,235 | Do. |
| Missouri | 1,479,500 | 1,541,796 | Do. |
| Montana | 82,500 | 193,237 | Do. |
| Nebraska | 379,500 | 256,318 | Decrease. |
| Nevada | 49,500 | 60,525 | Increase. |
| New Hampshire | 104,500 | 115,791 | Do. |
| New Jersey | 1,727,000 | 986,189 | Decrease. |
| New Mexico | 60,500 | 271,872 | Increasd. |

*Re Public Law 396, 79th Cong., school-lunch program*—Continued

| State | Proportional part of— | | Increase or decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount paid | Amount received | |
| New York | $11,022,000 | $4,018,877 | Decrease. |
| North Carolina | 1,485,000 | 2,957,399 | Increase. |
| North Dakota | 60,500 | 169,220 | Do. |
| Ohio | 3,514,500 | 2,269,988 | Decrease. |
| Oklahoma | 396,000 | 1,418,010 | Increase. |
| Oregon | 374,000 | 484,864 | Do. |
| Pennsylvania | 4,350,500 | 1,158,441 | Decrease. |
| Rhode Island | 308,000 | 202,217 | Do. |
| South Carolina | 247,500 | 2,128,789 | Increase. |
| South Dakota | 60,500 | 198,510 | Do. |
| Tennessee | 440,000 | 2,241,273 | Do. |
| Texas | 1,457,500 | 3,544,115 | Do. |
| Utah | 110,000 | 353,268 | Do. |
| Vermont | 60,500 | 128,291 | Do. |
| Virginia | 1,023,000 | 1,216,214 | Do. |
| Washington | 737,000 | 830,383 | Do. |
| West Virginia | 264,000 | 1,117,564 | Do. |
| Wisconsin | 1,144,000 | 956,942 | Decrease. |
| Wyoming | 44,000 | 180,932 | Increase. |
| Total | 54,307,000 | 54,388,677 | |

NOTE.—The round figure of $55,000,000 was used to compute the figures in column 1. Column 1 would equal this $55,000,000 if the District of Columbia tax percentage was included.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also have a table showing the distribution of the agricultural conservation payments by States. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Re agricultural conservation program (payments)—Appropriation: Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, fiscal year 1946—Table showing amount of each State's contribution to the subject appropriation (according to Federal income-tax percentages) and the amount of payments received by each State under subject appropriation*

| State | Proportional part of— | | Increase or decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount contributed | Amount received | |
| Alabama | $1,495,785 | $4,538,000 | +$3,042,215 |
| Arizona | 481,693 | 1,283,000 | +801,307 |
| Arkansas | 633,807 | 4,065,000 | +3,431,193 |
| California | 21,093,113 | 8,340,000 | −12,753,113 |
| Colorado | 1,521,138 | 4,495,000 | +2,973,862 |
| Connecticut | 4,385,947 | 511,000 | −3,874,947 |
| Delaware | 2,509,877 | 657,000 | −1,852,877 |
| Florida | 2,459,173 | 2,093,000 | −366,173 |
| Georgia | 2,535,230 | 4,442,000 | +1,906,770 |
| Idaho | 380,284 | 2,322,000 | +1,941,716 |
| Illinois | 22,183,262 | 10,745,000 | −11,438,262 |
| Indiana | 5,729,619 | 6,683,000 | +953,381 |
| Iowa | 2,002,831 | 14,626,000 | +12,623,169 |
| Kansas | 2,433,820 | 7,967,000 | +5,533,180 |
| Kentucky | 4,436,652 | 9,944,000 | +5,507,348 |
| Louisiana | 2,154,945 | 2,640,000 | +485,055 |
| Maine | 836,625 | 883,000 | +46,375 |
| Maryland | 4,512,709 | 2,100,000 | −2,412,709 |
| Massachusetts | 9,076,123 | 784,000 | −8,292,123 |
| Michigan | 12,321,217 | 6,550,000 | −5,771,217 |
| Minnesota | 3,752,140 | 14,528,000 | +10,775,860 |
| Mississippi | 583,102 | 5,082,000 | +4,498,898 |
| Missouri | 6,819,768 | 9,144,000 | +2,324,232 |
| Montana | 380,284 | 6,249,000 | +5,868,716 |
| Nebraska | 1,749,308 | 7,719,000 | +5,969,692 |
| Nevada | 228,170 | 324,000 | +95,830 |
| New Hampshire | 481,693 | 339,000 | −142,693 |
| New Jersey | 7,960,622 | 1,279,000 | −6,681,622 |
| New Mexico | 278,875 | 2,946,000 | +2,667,125 |
| New York | 50,806,009 | 6,681,000 | −44,125,009 |
| North Carolina | 6,845,121 | 5,655,000 | −1,190,121 |
| North Dakota | 278,875 | 13,121,000 | +12,842,125 |
| Ohio | 16,200,119 | 7,187,000 | −9,013,119 |
| Oklahoma | 1,825,365 | 6,593,000 | +4,767,635 |
| Oregon | 1,723,956 | 2,763,000 | +1,039,044 |
| Pennsylvania | 20,053,669 | 5,950,000 | −14,103,669 |
| Rhode Island | 1,419,728 | 87,000 | −1,332,728 |
| South Carolina | 1,140,853 | 2,339,000 | +1,198,147 |
| South Dakota | 278,875 | 6,369,000 | +6,090,125 |
| Tennessee | 2,028,184 | 7,947,000 | +5,918,816 |
| Texas | 6,718,359 | 19,988,000 | +13,269,641 |
| Utah | 507,046 | 1,173,000 | +665,954 |
| Vermont | 278,875 | 1,027,000 | +748,125 |
| Virginia | 4,715,527 | 4,804,000 | +88,473 |

*Re agricultural conservation program (payments)*—Continued

| State | Proportional part of— | | Increase or decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount contributed | Amount received | |
| Washington | $3,397,208 | $3,478,000 | +$80,792 |
| West Virginia | 1,216,910 | 1,974,000 | +757,090 |
| Wisconsin | 5,273,278 | 9,749,000 | +4,475,722 |
| Wyoming | 202,818 | 2,138,000 | +1,935,182 |
| Total | 250,328,587 | [1]253,523,000 | |

[1] Including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and naval stores—not listed.

NOTE.—If the District of Columbia tax percentage was included and the figures carried out to dollars and cents, total of column 1 would equal $253,523,000. (District of Columbia percentage—$3,194,389.80; cents not included—$23.20.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, an analysis of these tables will explain why certain States must insist upon a continuation of these programs. The administrative expenses of the programs are not included in the tables.

I realize that it is useless to criticize the increase in appropriations at this time, but I wish to let the people of the various States know how they fare in these programs. Perhaps with this knowledge we can approach appropriation bills with more caution another year.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the Senate is now bound to consider the controversy between the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, the Chair doubts whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are prepared to go forward.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am reluctant to go forward at this time. Certainly I would not wish to do so in the absence of the Senator from West Virginia.

TRUSTEESHIP AGREEMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator makes a motion to adjourn or recess, the Chair suggests that he would like very much, under the circumstances, if he might be permitted to clear up the trusteeship agreement problem, because the Chair is very sure that it can be done in 10 minutes.

Is there objection to a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 233, Calendar No. 526, which unanimously passed the House? The joint resolution relates to trusteeship agreements.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233), authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233) authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding the joint resolution.

The Security Council of the United Nations has unanimously agreed to this trusteeship agreement, on the basis of recognizing the ex-mandated Japanese islands in the Pacific as strategic areas. It is the only strategic trusteeship which the Security Council has developed. It applies, as the Senate knows, to the 98 ex-mandated Japanese islands. The House of Representatives has unanimously passed the joint resolution. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously approved the joint resolution. However, before it did so, it called before it for categorical cross-examination the five men who are most responsible for the national security, namely, Secretary of State Marshall, Secretary of War Patterson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz.

I say to my colleagues that each of these five officers of the Government, representing the top responsibility for national security, categorically says that the national security is amply and adequately protected under the strategic agreement; and each of the five categorically recommends passage of the joint resolution in the name of national security.

Under all these circumstances, I am sure there ceases to be the slightest controversy, and I hope that the House joint resolution may pass, and that the Senate joint resolution may be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 143 is indefinitely postponed.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—REFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF BURTON N. BEHLING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Executive Resolution 52 will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1952, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate briefly on a bill which I introduced earlier in the day, dealing with the disposition of our ex-Presidents.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been engaged in conversation, and I did not hear what the Senator said. Is the Senator from Maine undertaking to obtain consideration of the measure which he introduced earlier in the day?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I intended to speak about it, to elucidate the reasons why I am interested in it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, am I to understand that the pending business is the resolution to discharge the Committee on Public Works from further consideration of the nomination of Burton N. Behling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will that be the pending business when the Senate convenes tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be determined by whether or not the resolution is disposed of prior to the close of business today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Will it not also depend on whether the Senate recesses or adjourns?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senate adjourn, the pending business will be the order of business at the close of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to go into executive session would be in order at any time, for the reason that it is a privileged motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say to the Chair and to all Senators who may be interested that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and I are equally anxious to proceed with this question to the earliest possible determination. I shall rest comfortably in the belief that a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution tomorrow will be acted upon favorably, and that we can move forward from then on to a conclusion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I heartily join in the expressed wish that we proceed promptly. I may say further that, because this matter has been delayed so long—not through the fault of the Senator from Maine or myself, but because of important business pending from day to day before the Senate—we have reached the point where action must be taken. Unless we can dispose of the question, since the nomination is before the Committee on Public Works, I shall be impelled, under the circumstances, to give notice of a hearing upon the nomination. For that reason, I think the question of jurisdiction should be determined just as early as possible, and tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be a motion to adjourn and that after the morning hour this matter will be taken up. I am speaking this evening only because it was my understanding that the two Senators immediately concerned would prefer to take the matter up in the morning rather than try to conclude it tonight. That was my only reason for seeking the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Maine proceed, but I am ready to proceed at any time, and should like to dispose of the matter as soon as possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have spoken with my colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and he felt that it would unduly delay the Senate, since we have been in late session for several days.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Undoubtedly, we would not conclude it this afternoon, unless we hold a very late session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to go into executive session is in order at any time, whether it be later this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have talked with the majority leader and also with several other Members. I am hoping that the majority leader will give notice that if convenient the calendar will be called tomorrow for the consideration of all measures reported after July 3, when the calendar was last called, because bills are coming in now en masse. I think it will not take very long to dispose of the bills which are not in controversy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the President yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the first order of business is the passage of the appropriation bills. Government employees are going without their salaries, and the bills are long past due. We should consider those bills as rapidly as they are reported to the Senate. I have no doubt that we can reach a point in the consideration of the appropriation bills when the calendar can be called, but I think the appropriation bills should have first priority.

Mr. WHITE. In connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said, notice should be given before there is a call of the calendar. I agree that the pendency of appropriation bills is of such transcendent importance that they should not be shunted aside except for reasons of the greatest importance.

Mr. TAFT. If agreeable to the Senator, I think probably by Wednesday we can call the calendar.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It was not my idea to interfere with the regular order. If we had not had notice that the Senator from Maine had a speech in his system we could have cleared it up in 20 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would take a couple of hours.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I object to any intimation that the Senator from Maine has delayed the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is utterly impossible to proceed without a quorum call, and I am sure there will be some difficulty in getting a quorum without any previous notice. So I hope the Senator will withdraw the suggestion that the junior Senator from Maine is responsible for the calendar not now being called.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator misinterpreted by remark. I probably spoke too fast. I said that if the Senator had not had a speech in his system, and notice had been given, we might easily conclude the call of the calendar in 20 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator makes me think of the gentleman who said that if he had some bread he could have a ham sandwich if he had some ham.

DESIGNATION OF EX-PRESIDENTS AS SENATORS AT LARGE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I suppose we find no complaint more frequently expressed in executive and legislative offices than that concerning our inability to keep experienced men in Government.

Despite the inducements Government offers, men who attain the caliber to administer and to advise wisely, shortly find the inducements of private enterprise in this free economy of our so attractive that they abandon public office and leave their places to be filled by understudies. Hence we find our administrators, counsellors, and prosecutors too often men who lack experience and maturity of judgment. Government service becomes the preparatory school, or the stepping stone for our law firms and business houses.

There is no full remedy for this situation. So long as the profit motive prevails, and our whole economic structure rightly builds upon that urge, we shall continue to see our most capable men seek the less tumultuous and better-paid life of business and the professions. We can remedy this in part only by increasing the attractiveness of Government service through better salaries, greater assurance of security, and more liberal retirement provisions. Considerable progress has been made along these lines in recent years, but at one point we have been sacrificing needlessly men who are by all odds equipped to render our Government a service beyond that of all others. I speak of the highly extravagant and singularly ruthless abandonment of the men who have served this Nation in the highest office of the land.

History records some very tragic personal consequences of this oversight. Numbers of the men who have served as President have ended their years in financial distress, and a few in abject poverty. It seems a paradox that the man endorsed by the electorate to bear the gravest responsibilities for the Nation's welfare should suddenly find himself completely removed from the intense activity of the Presidency, shorn of all his power and authority, and without even a forum within which he may feel free to speak.

Rutherford B. Hayes described the situation in which an ex-President finds himself in these words:

> There is no place in the United States for an ex-President. If I could go into any of the great business enterprises of the country, I would hardly fit, and the country would not think it proper, so I am devoting my life to delivering lectures before schools, academies and colleges.

This situation lends itself to a very simple and, in my opinion, a very proper solution. I have today introduced a bill to create an office in the Senate of the United States for our ex-Presidents. My bill gives the title of this office "Senator at Large"——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a provision of the Constitution which I think makes it impracticable for the Senator to accomplish that which he is proposing. Section 3 of article I of the Constitution provides:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, * * * and each Senator shall have one vote.

If we create another office of Senator it would seem to me that it would be in violation of that section of the Constitution.

I do not wish to take up the Senator's time unless he is interested.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite interested.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Constitution also provides for amendment of the Constitution, and says that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. The Senator might say that since an ex-President serving as Senator at Large could not vote, that clause of the Constitution would not be impinged upon. But if he could not vote, what would be do in the Senate? He could talk; but we have plenty of that now. He might appear before committees and make speeches, but he could not vote.

It seems to me that the Senator ought to give serious consideration to those clauses in the Constitution before he goes very far with his bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will say to the Senator from Texas that I appreciate his interest. This matter has at various times had a good deal of consideration. While there is some conflict of opinion, the prevailing opinion of the legislative council with whom I took the matter up, is that it would be feasible. The Senator very properly points out that the matter of suffrage could not be affected.

Mr. CONNALLY. But suffrage is not all. The Constitution provides that the States shall not be deprived of their equal representation in the Senate. Voting is not all of their representation. They lobby and talk to many Senators. That is a part of representation, as well as is suffrage.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I feel that there is much in what the Senator from Texas has said. It seems to me the distinction is plainly one of creating an office. I question whether we could create an additional Senator unless there were a constitutional amendment. I am satisfied that an office could be created, if it did not impinge upon constitutional provisions.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 14, 1947

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

# TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For personal services in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the

1 Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be trans-
2 ferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or
3 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
5 the Department shall determine are appropriate to the re-
6 quirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such
7 appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That, of
8 appropriations herein made which are available for the pur-
9 chase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each
10 option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land:
11 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
12 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or
13 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
14 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, com-
15 mission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any
16 prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage
17 threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
18 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
19 *ther,* That, except to provide materials required in or incident
20 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
21 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this
22 Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured
23 from commodities or materials produced outside of the
24 United States.

1 PENALTY MAIL

2 For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of
3 the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944
4 (39 U. S. C. 321d), (1)~~$3,186,000~~ *$3,486,000.*

5 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

6 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions
7 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including
8 in addition to the objects for which funds are available for
9 such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bank-
10 head-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration,
12 planning, and coordination of research under section 10
13 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary
14 expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the
15 Act, as follows:

16 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
17 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9
18 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
19 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, (2)~~$3,000,000~~
20 *$2,500,000,* (3)~~of which such amount as shall be allotable to~~
21 ~~Alaska shall be transferred to and make a part of the appro-~~
22 ~~priation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska",~~
23 ~~without matching requirement~~*: Provided, That section 11*
24 *of said Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended by said Act of*
25 *August 14, 1946, is amended by striking out "authorized to*

1 *be appropriated under section 9 (a)" and inserting in lieu*
2 *thereof "appropriated pursuant to section 9 (a)";*
3 For research on utilization and associated problems
4 pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, (4)~~$2,500,000~~
5 *$3,000,000*;
6 For cooperative research other than research on utiliza-
7 tion of agricultural commodities and the products thereof,
8 pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act, $1,500,000;
9 For the improvement and development, independently or
10 through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and
11 others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and
12 marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricul-
13 tural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August
14 14, 1946), (5)~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,500,000*;
15 In all, (6)~~$9,000,000~~ *$9,500,000*: *Provided,* That such
16 sums as may be necessary for penalty mail as required by the
17 Act of June 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular
18 departmental appropriation therefor: *Provided further,* That
19 for necessary printing and binding there may be transferred
20 to, and made a part of, the item "Printing and binding,
21 Department of Agriculture," such sums as are necessary:
22 *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to
23 any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts
24 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the
25 functions for which it is made, and any such amounts shall

be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department (7)~~: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof~~.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, (8)~~$2,025,000~~ *$2,225,000,* together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed (9)~~$1,597,000~~ *$1,500,000*: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau

1 of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives
2 of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
3 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
4 such appropriations or authorizations.

5 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
8 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, docu-
9 ments, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display
10 of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and
11 the coordination of informational work in the Department,
12 $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropria-
13 tions or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the
14 Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which
15 several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by
16 the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be trans-
17 ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total
18 appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be
19 used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal
20 services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for prepara-
21 tion and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the prepara-
22 tion, distribution, and display of motion and sound pic-
23 tures, $67,400: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the
25 current fiscal year from which transfers to this appro-

1 priation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed
2 or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in
3 the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be
4 transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount
5 which may be expended for personal services in the District
6 of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
7 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
8 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall deter-
9 mine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such
10 reductions or increases in such appropriations or authoriza-
11 tions: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that
12 in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and
13 motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs
14 of the various agencies of the Department can be more advan-
15 tageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office
16 of Information, as the central agency of the Department
17 therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these
18 purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this
19 appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be avail-
20 able for the objects specified herein, including personal serv-
21 ices in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in
22 the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Depart-
23 ment, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for
24 employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706
25 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944

1 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred
2 to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of
3 the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600): *Provided,*
4 That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the estab-
5 lishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or
6 for the compensation of employees in such offices except that
7 not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San
8 Francisco radio office.

9 PRINTING AND BINDING

10 For printing and binding for the Department, includ-
11 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services,
12 except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the
13 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
14 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report
15 of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
16 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915
17 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and
18 in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
19 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
20 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
21 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
22 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent
23 out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators,
24 Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall

1 direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants
2 of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on
3 Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220); and including not to exceed
5 $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one
6 thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Sen-
7 ate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual re-
8 port of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture),
9 as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
10 (44 U. S. C. 241): *Provided,* That the Secretary may
11 transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made
12 for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources"
13 such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding
14 in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural
15 Adjustment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry
16 into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act
17 approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as
18 may be necessary for printing and binding in connection
19 with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated
20 (10)~~for administering the provisions of the Agricultural~~
21 ~~Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d),~~
22 ~~such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in~~
23 ~~connection therewith~~ *to carry into effect the terms of section*
24 *23 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as*
25 *amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and*

1 *binding in connection with the activities under section 32:*
2 *Provided further,* That the total amount that may be trans-
3 ferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso
4 shall not exceed (11)~~$95,300~~ *$170,000.*

5 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

6 For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference
7 books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals,
8 and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to
9 exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by
10 the Secretary, for library membership in societies or asso-
11 ciations which issue publications to members only or at a
12 price to members lower than to subscribers who are not
13 members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may
14 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

16 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed
17 (12)~~$1,887,000~~ *$2,387,000* for personal services in the Dis-
18 trict of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at
19 $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the
20 purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers,
21 as follows:

22 Economic investigations: For conducting investigations
23 and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among
24 the people of the United States, relative to agricultural
25 production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation

1 in their broadest aspects, including farm management and
2 practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing
3 of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor,
4 farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in pro-
5 duction to probable demand for the different farm and food
6 products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and
7 income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for
8 their variations and trends, (13) ~~$1,743,600~~ *$2,243,600*:
9 *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or
10 made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics
11 under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used
12 for State and county land-use planning, for conducting
13 cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.
14 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
15 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
16 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-
17 stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
18 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
19 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production,
20 distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pur-
21 suant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and
22 for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as
23 provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
24 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided*,
25 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be avail-

able for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

## OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $500 for newspapers, (14)~~$428,000~~ *$578,000.*

## INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL COMMITTEES

Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural surpluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, together with traveling and other necessary expenses relating thereto.

1 EXTENSION SERVICE

2 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO

3 RICO

4 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
5 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:
6 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
7 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
8 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
9 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7
10 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section
11 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended
12 by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1),
13 $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
14 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000;
15 Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.
16 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to
17 the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the
18 Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending
19 the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of
20 Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico,
21 the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g)
22 extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones
23 Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketchum,
24 Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2 Administration and coordination of extension work:
3 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the
4 Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–
5 348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and
6 to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the
7 several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200,
8 of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
13 Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Admin-
14 istrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and
16 furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Re-
17 search Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred
18 to the Department, from Government surplus without
19 reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property,
20 valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries
21 of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Mary-
22 land, consisting of approximately 88 acres of land
23 known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately 40
24 acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided,*

1 That the appropriation current at the time services are
2 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
3 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from ap-
4 plicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including
5 handling and other related services, for equipment rentals
6 (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for
7 services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores
8 of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
9 construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center
10 in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations
11 and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their
12 proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
13 Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further,*
14 That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research
15 Administration shall be available for the construction, altera-
16 tion, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided,*
17 *however,* That unless otherwise provided, the cost of con-
18 structing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting
19 greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for
20 construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall
21 be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved
22 therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the
23 fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the
24 cost of the building as certified by the Research Administra-
25 tor, whichever is greater.

1 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF
2 AGRICULTURE

3 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
4 Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b,
5 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of sec-
6 tion 5 of the said Act, and for special research work,
7 including the planning, programing, coordination, and
8 printing the results of such research, to be conducted by
9 such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may
10 designate or establish, and to which he may make allot-
11 ments from this fund, including personal services in the
12 District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200
13 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of
14 research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural
15 regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

16 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
17 MATERIALS

18 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
19 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
20 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946,
21 in connection with natural rubber, including personal serv-
22 ices in the District of Columbia, $349,000; and there shall
23 be transferred to the Secretary, from Government surplus
24 without compensation therefor, real property consisting of

1 approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres known
2 as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the
3 Guidotti tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-
4 five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the
5 vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and
6 laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal
7 property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately
8 $865,000.

9 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

10 (15)~~To enable the Secretary, through such officers and~~
11 ~~employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Terri-~~
12 ~~tory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain~~
13 ~~a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and~~
14 ~~problems of the Territory of Alaska $144,940, including~~
15 ~~printing and binding, the employment of personal services~~
16 ~~in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisi-~~
17 ~~tion of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to~~
18 ~~restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program~~
19 ~~the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have~~
20 ~~heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the~~
21 ~~Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station~~
22 ~~of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United~~
23 ~~States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and~~
24 ~~with other public and private agencies. The provisions of~~

1 ~~this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of~~
2 ~~the enactment hereof, and the Secretary is authorized to take~~
3 ~~such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine~~
4 ~~to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities here-~~
5 ~~under. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use~~
6 ~~of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds~~
7 ~~of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including~~
8 ~~its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than~~
9 ~~any land in general use heretofore for other university pur-~~
10 ~~poses, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable~~
11 ~~continue the employment of the existing personnel of the~~
12 ~~station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in-~~
13 ~~cluding the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby~~
14 ~~transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended bal-~~
15 ~~ances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for~~
16 ~~credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the~~
17 ~~legislature or acquired under authority of law for the con-~~
18 ~~struction, use, and development of the Territorial agricul-~~
19 ~~tural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be~~
20 ~~unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall~~
21 ~~be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secre-~~
22 ~~tary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the~~
23 ~~transfer.~~

1 ~~OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS~~

2 ~~PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO~~

3 ~~For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico~~
4 ~~to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the~~
5 ~~provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural~~
6 ~~experiments stations:~~

7 ~~Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related~~
8 ~~Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.~~
9 ~~C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), $720,000; Adams Act,~~
10 ~~the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),~~
11 ~~$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,~~
12 ~~1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373, 376, 380, 382),~~
13 ~~$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act ap-~~
14 ~~proved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), $2,661,268,~~
15 ~~none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the~~
16 ~~Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b),~~
17 ~~extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the~~
18 ~~Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act~~
19 ~~approved March 4, 1931, as amended (70 U. S. C. 386d-~~
20 ~~386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress~~
21 ~~to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,~~
22 ~~and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.~~

23 ~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

24 ~~Administration of grants and coordination of research~~
25 ~~with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed~~

~~$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-369, 370-383, 386, 386d-386f); relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.~~

(16) *To enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $100,000, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law, including the construction of such buildings and facilities upon land provided by the Territory or otherwise.*

1 *Office of Experiment Stations*

2 *PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND*

3 *PUERTO RICO*

4 *For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto*
5 *Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect*
6 *the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural*
7 *experiment stations:*

8 *Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related*
9 *Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U.*
10 *S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams*
11 *Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),*
12 *$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,*
13 *1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380,*
14 *382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act*
15 *approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g),*
16 *$2,663,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928*
17 *(7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain*
18 *Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000;*
19 *Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C.*
20 *386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Terri-*
21 *tory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of*
22 *the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), ex-*
23 *tending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the*
24 *Territory of Alaska, $27,500; in all, for Alaska, $42,500;*
25 *Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended*

1 *(70 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain*
2 *Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments*
3 *to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,206,208.*

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 *Administration of grants and coordination of research*
6 *with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed*
7 *$197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia,*
8 *to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,*
9 *1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16,*
10 *1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20,*
11 *1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363,*
12 *365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and*
13 *for the administration of an agricultural experiment*
14 *station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall*
15 *prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required*
16 *under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are*
17 *in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research*
18 *work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment sta-*
19 *tions in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of*
20 *the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon*
21 *to Congress.*

22 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses
23 necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment
24 station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration,
25 and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

1 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
4 (17)~~$1,059,000~~ *$1,061,840* for departmental personal serv-
5 ices in the District of Columbia, for carrying out the pro-
6 visions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of
7 Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations
8 concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the
9 domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

10 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
11 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
12 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
13 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
14 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
15 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
16 ucts, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

17 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
18 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,
19 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.

20 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
21 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
22 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
23 disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided,* That no part of the
24 money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating
25 owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supple-

1 mentary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county,
2 or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place,
3 nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation
4 for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspec-
5 tion or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall
6 belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or
7 corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
8 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That
9 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as com-
10 pensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall ex-
11 ceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value
12 of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no
13 payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be
14 paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where
15 the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall
16 any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade
17 animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

18 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
19 tine work, including the control and eradication of hog
20 cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks,
21 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the super-
22 vision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of
23 vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the
24 inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance

1 with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and
2 the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the in-
3 spection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
4 $1,225,197.

5 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
6 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products,
7 (18)~~$5,000,000~~ *$11,140,000* (19)~~, for deposit in the Treas-~~
8 ~~ury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal~~
9 ~~year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund",~~
10 ~~which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish~~
11 ~~an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter~~
12 ~~every person, firm, public agency, or other organization~~
13 ~~furnished inspection or service under said laws, including~~
14 ~~inspection of meat and meat food products offered for import~~
15 ~~or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse meat~~
16 ~~products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance~~
17 ~~with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture~~
18 ~~and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments,~~
19 ~~to be deposited in the meat inspection fund, shall provide full~~
20 ~~reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the~~
21 ~~furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific~~
22 ~~and technical investigations and laboratory services; investi-~~
23 ~~gations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions~~
24 ~~under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; super-~~
25 ~~visory, administrative, statistical, business management, and~~

1 ~~other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia~~
2 ~~and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal~~
3 ~~Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District~~
4 ~~of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger~~
5 ~~motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase~~
6 ~~of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized~~
7 ~~by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided,* That the Secretary~~
9 ~~of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of~~
10 ~~bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the~~
11 ~~interests of the United States, and may withhold or with-~~
12 ~~draw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges~~
13 ~~or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of pay-~~
14 ~~ment: *Provided further,* That inspection or other technical~~
15 ~~services may be rendered to Government and other public~~
16 ~~agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein~~
17 ~~provided: *Provided further,* That a schedule of obligations~~
18 ~~and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the~~
19 ~~close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for~~
20 ~~the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the~~
21 ~~Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided*~~
22 ~~*further,* That payments shall be made for inspection or service~~
23 ~~rendered on and after July 1, 1947.~~

24 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
25 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),

1 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
2 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manu-
3 factured in the United States and the importation of such
4 products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
5 animals, (20)~~$290,000~~ *$340,000.*

6 Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum:
7 The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section
8 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May
9 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year
10 for which appropriations are herein made to carry into
11 effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved
12 August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal
13 services in the District of Columbia.

14 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
15 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

16 For expenses necessary, including personal services in the
17 District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-
18 and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia,
19 or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or
20 European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
21 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
22 future purchases and destruction of animals (including poul-
23 try) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated
24 by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and
25 irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar

1 circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful
2 quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums
3 from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary
4 may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency
5 which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the coun-
6 try: *Provided,* That the payment for such animals hereafter
7 purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat,
8 egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of ap-
9 praisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any
10 such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production,
11 or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emer-
12 gency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the
13 United States Government for any such animals shall not
14 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
15 That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
16 appraisal is the same for each bird.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
19 not to exceed (21) ~~$500,000~~ *$540,912* for personal services
20 in the District of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions
21 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including
22 investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy in-
23 dustry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act
24 of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to
25 process or renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June

1 24, 1946 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908
2 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation
3 of process or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

4 For repair of buildings, fence, electric line and feed
5 bunk, recently damaged by tornado at the dairy field station,
6 Woodward, Oklahoma, $5,300.

7 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
8 ENGINEERING

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
11 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
12 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant indus-
13 tries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application
14 of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
15 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
16 control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the
17 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
18 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
19 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
20 possessions for introduction into the United States, includ-
21 ing explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing
22 in this country; for the operation and maintenance of air-
23 planes; and for personal services in the city of Washington,
24 as follows:

25 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-

1 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn,
2 cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums,
3 soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other
4 field crops, $2,784,000.

5 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations
6 on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vege-
7 table, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide,
8 and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be
9 transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and
10 Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus with-
11 out compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied
12 by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under per-
13 mit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels
14 of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres,
15 situated at Chapman Field Military Reservation, Dade
16 County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approxi-
17 mately $7,000.

18 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
19 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
20 control, (22)~~$359,280~~ *$379,280.*

21 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
22 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
23 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
24 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
25 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural

1 use; soil management and crop production on dry and irri-
2 gated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by
3 crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system
4 and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and
5 determination of their potential productivity under adapted
6 cropping and improved soil management; (23) ~~$1,391,000~~
7 *$1,491,000.*

8 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
9 the application of engineering principles to agriculture, includ-
10 ing farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanita-
11 tion, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appur-
12 tenances and buildings for processing and storing farm prod-
13 ucts, and the preparation and distribution of building plans
14 and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering
15 problems relating to the production, processing, transporta-
16 tion, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

17 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
18 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
19 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
20 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council,
21 $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be avail-
22 able for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed
23 $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the
24 second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of

1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement and repair of buildings, equipment and supplies, utilities, fences and other general repairs and clean-up operations from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward, Oklahoma, $45,600.

## Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious

1 insects and plant pests; including the operation and mainte-
2 nance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed seven,
3 and not to exceed (24)~~$692,000~~ *$758,688* for personal
4 services in the District of Columbia, as follows:

5 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
6 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
7 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
8 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
9 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
10 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
11 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
12 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for in-
13 vestigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies
14 of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange
15 with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other
16 arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and appara-
17 tus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradica-
18 tion and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for
19 investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods
20 of their manufacture and use and the effects of their applica-
21 tion, $2,961,300.

22 Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out oper-
23 ations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
24 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
25 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths,

1 Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal
2 rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the
3 enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with
4 States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant
5 Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C.
6 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-
7 free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation
8 of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February
9 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic
10 plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the
11 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
12 transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine
13 laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal In-
14 spection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), (25) ~~$2,697,100~~ *$3,047,100*:
15 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to
16 pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or
17 other property injured or destroyed: *Provided further*, That,
18 in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropria-
19 tion shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil
20 in any State until such State has provided cooperation neces-
21 sary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication
22 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
23 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
24 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
25 tions for the accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided fur-*

1 *ther,* That in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures
2 from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods
3 of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where meas-
4 ures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
5 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
6 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
7 or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor
8 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
9 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State,
10 county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations
11 concerned: *Provided, however,* That expenditures incurred for
12 removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-
13 Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appro-
14 priations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further,*
15 That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
16 removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm
17 disease except where such trees are located on property
18 owned or controlled by the Government of the United States,
19 or on property included within local experimental control
20 areas.

21 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
22 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
23 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines
24 and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the
25 Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7

1 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C.
2 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C.
3 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they
4 pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement
5 of regulations governing the movement of plants into and
6 from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15
7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended,
8 and for inspection and certification of plants and plant prod-
9 ucts to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries,
10 as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944
11 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

12 CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND
13 PLANT DISEASES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
16 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of air-
17 planes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys
18 and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the
19 Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
20 employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

21 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
24 and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to

1 exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, as follows:

3 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
4 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
5 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chem-
6 istry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical,
7 microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds,
8 drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the
9 manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological
10 effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products
11 and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of
12 methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and
13 starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for
14 such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the
15 utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack
16 investigations; $511,500, and there shall be transferred to
17 the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from
18 Government surplus without compensation therefor, a cer-
19 tain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (con-
20 sisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser Subdivision,
21 and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728 in the city of Pasadena,
22 California), valued at approximately $15,800.

23 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
24 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
25 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-

1 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
2 stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation,
3 and utilization of naval stores; $152,550.

4 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the re-
5 searches established under the provisions of section 202 (a)
6 to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjust-
7 ment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on
8 food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including
9 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity
10 and equipment storage building at the Western Regional
11 Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

12 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

13 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
14 not to exceed (26)~~$381,700~~ *$305,000* for personal services
15 in the District of Columbia, for conducting investigations of
16 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for
17 food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special sug-
18 gestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization
19 of such products for these purposes, and such economic in-
20 vestigations, including housing and household buying, as
21 have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home,
22 and for disseminating useful information on this subject.
23 (27)~~$1,045,000~~ *$800,000.*

24 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

25 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the

1 Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including
2 personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000,
3 of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Depart-
4 ment of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust
5 on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of
6 that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under
7 the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United
8 States; $1,974,650 of said amonut to the Forest Service
9 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
10 lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount
11 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for
12 leadership and general coordination of the entire program,
13 method development, and for operations conducted under
14 its direction for such control, including, but not confined to
15 the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
16 State and privately owned lands.

17 FOREST SERVICE

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed
20 (28)~~$1,055,378~~ *$1,083,378* for personal services in the Dis-
21 trict of Columbia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
22 suant to the second sentence of 706 (a) of the Organic Act
23 of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the
24 Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replace-

1 ment of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of
2 Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and
3 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
4 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall
5 be used for any experiment or test made outside
6 the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of
7 woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate
8 and test American timber and timber trees and their uses,
9 and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
10 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
11 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
12 sary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building
13 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of
14 constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of con-
15 necting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the
16 cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected,
17 shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any
18 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which
19 was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appro-
20 priations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an
21 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such build-
22 ing as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and
23 improve the national forests, including tree planting and
24 other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil

1 waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to
2 ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national
3 forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to
4 stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate,
5 digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and
6 investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided,* That
7 not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National
8 forest protection and management", and not to exceed
9 $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation"
10 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and bind-
11 ing, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention
12 posters and related printed material, as follows:

13 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
14 tration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000
15 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
16 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
17 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

18 National forest protection and management: For the
19 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
20 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
21 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
22 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
23 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
24 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
25 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to

1 exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and
2 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
3 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-
4 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
5 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
6 except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct
7 purchases will be more economical than construction, im-
8 provements may be purchased; the construction (not
9 to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment,
10 and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities;
11 control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects;
12 timber cultural operations; development and application
13 of fish and game management plans; propagation and
14 transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semi-
15 arid portions of the national forests; estimating and
16 appraising of timber and other resources and development
17 and application of plans for their effective management, sale,
18 and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal
19 of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law
20 and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests
21 that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under
22 the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912
23 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
24 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of
25 water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or

1 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
2 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
3 administration and public use of the national forests; and all
4 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
5 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
6 (29) ~~$23,764,891~~ *$24,014,891*, of which not to exceed $25,-
7 000 shall be available for the purchase of one nursery site.

8 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
9 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service admin-
10 istration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
11 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes.
12 $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meet-
13 ing obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

14 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
15 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
16 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
17 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and mainte-
18 nance of improvements, as follows:

19 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, sil-
20 vicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
21 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investi-
22 gations and experiments to develop improved methods of
23 management of forest and other ranges under section 7,
24 at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere,
25 $2,475,000.

1 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
2 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
3 Laboratory, or elsewhere, (30)~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,250,000*, of
4 which at least $11,050 shall be expended for research in the
5 utilization of waste woods.

6 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
7 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
8 under section 10, (31)~~$572,000~~ *$822,000*.

9 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

10 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
11 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
12 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
13 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act
14 approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570),
15 $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be avail-
16 able for personal services in the District of Columbia.

17 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

18 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
19 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using indus-
20 tries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest
21 management principles to federally owned lands leased to
22 States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-
23 yield management, the conservation of the timber resources,
24 the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of em-
25 ployment and economic continuance of forest industries, and

1 to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department
2 as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm
3 Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b),
4 (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections
5 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766)
6 of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568),
7 and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed
8 $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended
9 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not
10 to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or pur-
11 chase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
12 *Provided,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the
13 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropria-
14 tion shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire
15 land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

16 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

17 Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands
18 under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as
19 amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), (32)~~$500,000~~
20 *$750,000*(33)~~, to be available only for payment toward the~~
21 ~~purchase price of any lands acquired~~*; the administrative cost*
22 *of such acquisition to be met from the appropriation "National*
23 *Forest Protection and Management".*

24 Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to
25 facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage origi-

1 nating within the exterior boundaries of the following
2 national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the
3 following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest
4 receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the follow-
5 ing amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National
6 Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337),
7 as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act
8 of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000;
9 San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside
10 County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634),
11 as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
12 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
13 amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
14 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland
15 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of
16 June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National
17 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
18 $35,000; in all $142,000.

19 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

20 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
21 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
22 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23,
23 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
24 nance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest
25 Service administration, (1) (34) ~~$10,000,000~~ *$11,000,000*

1 for forest development roads and trails, and (2) (35)~~$5,~~
2 ~~300,000~~ *$8,300,000* for forest highways, which sums are
3 authorized to be appropriated by the Act of December 20,
4 1944 (Public Law 521), in all, (36)~~$15,300,000~~ *$19,300,-*
5 *000* (including not to exceed (37)~~$100,000~~ *$109,530* for
6 personal services in the District of Columbia), to be imme-
7 diately available and to remain available until expended:
8 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
9 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
10 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and
11 supplies used for road and trail construction and main-
12 tenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased,
13 altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not
14 exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building
15 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
16 $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year
17 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of
18 such building as certified by the Secretary.

19 FLOOD CONTROL

20 Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance
21 with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as
22 amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examina-
23 tions and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
24 (38)~~$500,000~~ *$1,500,000,* including personal services in the
25 District of Columbia, to be immediately available and to re-

main available until expended, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated (39)~~: *Provided further,* That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances~~: *Provided further, That $1,000,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.*

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, including not to exceed (40)~~$838,500~~ *$875,000* for personal services in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, opera-

1 tion and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and
2 erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That
3 the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,
4 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or
5 sanitary system and connecting the same with any such
6 building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings
7 are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for
8 other purposes and except for eight buildings to be con-
9 structed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
10 *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this
11 Act shall be available for the construction of any such
12 building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided*
13 *further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State
14 has established a central State agency authorized to enter
15 into agreements with the United States or any of its
16 agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
17 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil con-
18 servation district in such State, the agreements made by or
19 on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
20 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
21 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
22 as follows:

23 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
24 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
25 erosion, soil and mositure depletion and methods of soil and

1 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
2 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
3 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
4 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all
5 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
6 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
7 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof) ; and for construc-
8 tion, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds,
9 stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, (41)~~$673,000~~
10 *$1,423,000.*

11 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive
12 measures to conserve soil and water, including such special
13 measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the
14 siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm
15 irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation
16 of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans
17 and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
18 $38,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
19 may be expended for soil and water conservation operations
20 in demonstration projects.

21 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
22 SUBMARGINAL LAND

23 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
24 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
25 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions

1 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179,
2 Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

4 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
5 ADMINISTRATION

6 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
7 RESOURCES

8 (42) ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
9 ~~carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 71, inclusive,~~
10 ~~of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ap-~~
11 ~~proved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-~~
12 ~~590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment~~
13 ~~Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except~~
14 ~~the provisions of sections 201, 202, 203, 381, and 383 and~~
15 ~~the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal serv-~~
16 ~~ices in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for~~
17 ~~the preparation and display of exhibits, including such dis-~~
18 ~~plays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the~~
19 ~~United States; $165,614,290, to remain available until De-~~
20 ~~cember 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said~~
21 ~~provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as~~
22 ~~amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,~~
23 ~~during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,~~
24 ~~inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of~~
25 ~~the total sum provided under this head shall be available~~

1 ~~during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other ad-~~
2 ~~ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs, but~~
3 ~~not more than $1,950,000 shall be transferred to the ap-~~
4 ~~propriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392,~~
5 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,*~~
6 ~~That payments to claimants hereunder shall be made upon the~~
7 ~~certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such~~
8 ~~form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out~~
9 ~~the conservation practice or practices and has complied with~~
10 ~~all other requirements as conditions for such payments and~~
11 ~~that the statements and information contained in the applica-~~
12 ~~tion for payment are correct and true, to the best of his~~
13 ~~knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March~~
14 ~~4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further,*~~
15 ~~That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available~~
16 ~~for functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment~~
17 ~~Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of~~
18 ~~February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or~~
19 ~~expenses of any regional information employees or any~~
20 ~~State or county information employees, but this shall not~~
21 ~~preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of informa-~~
22 ~~tion to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That no funds~~
23 ~~shall be available for salaries or other administrative expenses~~
24 ~~in connection with the formulation or administration of any~~
25 ~~1948 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-~~

1 ~~conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,~~
2 ~~as amended, or programs under the Agricultural Adjustment~~
3 ~~Act of 1938, as amended, except those pertaining to market-~~
4 ~~ing quotas under the latter Act: *Provided further,* That the~~
5 ~~Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer~~
6 ~~to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be neces-~~
7 ~~sary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing~~
8 ~~payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such~~
9 ~~amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, ferti-~~
10 ~~lizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any~~
11 ~~soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agri-~~
12 ~~cultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming~~
13 ~~practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947 program~~
14 ~~under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided*~~
15 ~~*further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make~~
16 ~~payments to farmers who complied with the terms and con-~~
17 ~~ditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated~~
18 ~~pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conserva-~~
19 ~~tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secre-~~
20 ~~tary determines that, because of induction into the armed~~
21 ~~forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were~~
22 ~~prevented from filing, applications for payment under any~~
23 ~~such program during the period the applicable appropri-~~
24 ~~ation for such program was available for obligation,~~
25 ~~such payments to be made out of the unobligated~~

1 ~~balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and Use~~
2 ~~of Agricultural Land Resources", in the Department of~~
3 ~~Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,*~~
4 ~~That an application for payment on the prescribed form is~~
5 ~~filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in~~
6 ~~case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer~~
7 ~~under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the~~
8 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7~~
9 ~~U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the~~
10 ~~date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December~~
11 ~~31, 1947, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That~~
12 ~~no part of any funds available to the Department, or~~
13 ~~any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting~~
14 ~~a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal~~
15 ~~year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any~~
16 ~~person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled~~
17 ~~"An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved~~
18 ~~August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in~~
19 ~~accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of~~
20 ~~July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or~~
21 ~~attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of~~
22 ~~Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services~~
23 ~~or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a~~
24 ~~Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or~~
25 ~~appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Mem-~~

1 ~~ber or through the proper official channels: *Provided*~~
2 ~~*further,* That where farmer participation in the program~~
3 ~~in any State, region, or area is not sufficient to require the full~~
4 ~~amount of the money apportioned thereto any such sum or~~
5 ~~sums in excess of such requirement shall be reapportioned to~~
6 ~~States, regions, or areas whose original apportionments have~~
7 ~~not been sufficient to meet such requirements.~~

8 *For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry*
9 *into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the*
10 *Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved*
11 *February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q),*
12 *and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of*
13 *1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the*
14 *provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the*
15 *provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services*
16 *in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the*
17 *preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays*
18 *at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United*
19 *States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December*
20 *31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provi-*
21 *sions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as*
22 *amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended,*
23 *pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out*
24 *during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947,*
25 *inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the*

1 *total sum provided under this head shall be available during*
2 *the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative*
3 *expenses for carrying out such programs, including the*
4 *peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photo-*
5 *graphs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not*
6 *more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropria-*
7 *tion account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agri-*
8 *cultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That*
9 *payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the*
10 *certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such*
11 *form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried*
12 *out the conservation practice or practices and has complied*
13 *with all other requirements as conditions for such payments*
14 *and that the statements and information contained in the*
15 *application for payment are correct and true, to the best of*
16 *his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of*
17 *March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided*
18 *further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or*
19 *made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural*
20 *Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Num-*
21 *bered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay*
22 *the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees*
23 *or any State or county information employees, but this shall*
24 *not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of*
25 *information to individual farmers: Provided further, That*

1 *such amount shall be available for salaries and other ad-*
2 *ministrative expenses in connection with the formulation and*
3 *administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,-*
4 *000,000, including administration, and formulated on the*
5 *basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments*
6 *and grants among the several States in accordance with*
7 *their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary:*
8 *Provided further, That the proportion going to a State*
9 *shall not be changed more than 15 per centum from the 1946*
10 *distribution and that no participant shall receive more than*
11 *$500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-con-*
12 *servation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936,*
13 *as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjust-*
14 *ment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants*
15 *under such program shall be conditioned upon the utiliza-*
16 *tion of land with respect to which such payments or grants*
17 *are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which*
18 *will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and*
19 *water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective*
20 *manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as*
21 *determined and approved by the State committee appointed*
22 *pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and*
23 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States:*
24 *Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion,*
25 *from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office*

1 *such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-*
2 *penses of said Office in auditing payments under this item:*
3 *Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for*
4 *the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other*
5 *farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and mak-*
6 *ing grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in*
7 *carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary*
8 *in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of*
9 *February 29, 1936, as amended: Provided further, That*
10 *the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments*
11 *to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of*
12 *the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant*
13 *to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and*
14 *Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary deter-*
15 *mines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the*
16 *United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented*
17 *from filing, applications for payment under any such pro-*
18 *gram during the period the applicable appropriation for*
19 *such program was available for obligation, such payments*
20 *to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropria-*
21 *tion, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources",*
22 *in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946:*
23 *Provided further, That an application for payment on the*
24 *prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person*
25 *entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or in-*

1 *competency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant*
2 *to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,*
3 *as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one*
4 *year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces,*
5 *or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: And provided*
6 *further, That no part of any funds available to the Depart-*
7 *ment, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency*
8 *constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the*
9 *current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel*
10 *expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating*
11 *the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political*
12 *activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who*
13 *has been found in accordance with the provisions of section*
14 *6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have*
15 *violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits*
16 *the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal*
17 *services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner*
18 *a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or*
19 *appropriation by Congress except upon request of any*
20 *Member or through the proper official channels.*
21 SUGAR ACT
22 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
23 visions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine
24 Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C.
25 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of

1 Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30,
2 1949: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers)
3 from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar
4 producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

5 (43)~~NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT~~

6 ~~To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions~~
7 ~~of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public~~
8 ~~Law 396), $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this~~
9 ~~appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources~~
10 ~~within the States derived from the sale of lunches.~~

11 (44)~~ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING~~
12 ~~AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS~~

13 ~~For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to~~
14 ~~administer the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing~~
15 ~~Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c-608d), including~~
16 ~~personal services in the District of Columbia, $525,300.~~

17 MARKETING SERVICES

18 For expenses necessary, including not to exceed (45)~~$2,~~
19 ~~211,000~~ *$2,286,000* for personal services in the District of
20 Columbia, in conducting investigations, experiments, and
21 demonstrations, as follows:

22 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
23 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely informa-
24 tion on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
25 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market

1 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
2 and poultry products (46)*(including broilers)*, fruits and
3 vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds,
4 cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products,
5 (47)~~$1,527,500~~ *$1,566,250.*

6 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
7 tions and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers
8 and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition
9 of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw,
10 dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product con-
11 taining an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when
12 offered for interstate shipment or when received at such im-
13 portant central markets as the Secretary may from time to
14 time designate, or at points which may be conveniently
15 reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may
16 prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be rea-
17 sonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the
18 service rendered, $712,000.

19 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
20 among the people of the United States useful information
21 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
22 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
23 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
24 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform stand-
25 ards of classification of American farm and food products

1 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as
2 provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and
3 for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition
4 services made available by Federal, State, and other agen-
5 cies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pur-
6 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
7 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by
8 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law
9 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and
10 other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per
11 diem of persons serving without compensation while away
12 from their homes or regular places of business; printing
13 and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers;
14 (48)~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,100,000: Provided,* That the Secretary
15 may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the
16 Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be
17 necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropria-
18 tion is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to
19 amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appro-
20 priation items in this Act.

21 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of
22 the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of
23 classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
24 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
25 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection

1 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
2 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as
3 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
4 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
5 $1,552,000.

6 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
7 and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the pro-
8 visions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act,
9 approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–
10 499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping
11 of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C.
12 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August
13 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the
14 Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and
15 splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21,
16 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

17 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
18 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
19 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
20 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
21 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–
22 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter
23 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures
24 (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the pro-

1 visions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved
2 March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.
3 United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect
4 the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act,
5 $1,128,000.
6 United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the
7 provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.
8 Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions
9 of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in
10 seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation
11 of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain
12 standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved
13 August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–
14 1610), $152,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250 of
15 this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United
16 States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing
17 Congress.
18 Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provi-
19 sions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
20 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
21 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.
22 Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions
23 of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C.
24 91–99), $41,000.

1 Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of
2 the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for
3 preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adul-
4 terated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other
5 insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic
6 therein, $293,500.

7 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provi-
8 sions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of
9 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291),
10 $138,000.

11 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

12 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary
13 to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity
14 Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including
15 not to exceed (49) ~~$141,000~~ *$153,000* for personal services
16 in the District of Columbia, $530,000.

17 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

18 For expenses necessary, including personal services in
19 the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions
20 of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the
21 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029),
22 as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
23 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and
24 Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

1 Loans: (50)~~For loans under~~ *Title I and section 43, $20,-*
2 *000,000;* title II, $60,000,000.

3 Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the
4 farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I,
5 $1,000,000.

6 Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing
7 of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting
8 of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation
9 of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pur-
10 suant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946,
11 (51)~~$18,000,000~~ *$24,000,000.*

12 All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
13 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
14 made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agricul-
15 ture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm
16 tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agri-
17 culture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations
18 and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of
19 1946 are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the
20 Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
21 poration is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close
22 of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the
23 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to
24 receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid
25 interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provi-

1 sions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other
2 evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security
3 therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes
4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due
5 and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the
6 time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid
7 principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid
8 interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30,
9 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no
10 further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary
11 of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of
12 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance
13 to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the
14 Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of
15 the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has
16 theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the
17 Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or ad-
18 vances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
19 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
20 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
21 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
22 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
23 or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments
24 to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall
25 be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

1 WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID
2 AREAS

3 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote
4 conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United
5 States by aiding in the development of facilities for water
6 storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as
7 amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000,
8 of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for per-
9 sonal services in the District of Columbia.

10 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

11 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
12 fication Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended
13 (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

14 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, in-
15 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; not to
16 exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for
17 financial and credit reports, (52)~~$4,000,000~~ *$5,000,000.*

18 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
19 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section
20 7 thereof, (53)~~$225,000,000~~ *$250,000,000,* to be borrowed
21 from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
22 provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act.

23 Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act
24 of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C.
25 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

1 "SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby
2 authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator,
3 upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agricul-
4 ture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year
5 commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,
6 as the Congress may from time to time determine to be
7 necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest
8 per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections
9 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may
10 determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers
11 from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the pro-
12 visions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural
13 Electrification Administration established by Executive
14 Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid
15 balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance
16 Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947,
17 shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for
18 loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the
19 foregoing provision: *Provided,* That such obligations in-
20 curred for the purpose of financing the construction and
21 operation of generating plants, electric transmission and
22 distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a
23 period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity
24 of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the
25 wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of

1 electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not
2 exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more
3 than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to
4 make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments,
5 and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to
6 effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of
7 the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such
8 trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Adminis-
9 trator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the
10 holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations
11 for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the
12 Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance
13 Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the
14 Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the
15 Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans
16 made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as
17 of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the
18 Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is author-
19 ized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30,
20 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary
21 of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all
22 loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest,
23 theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions
24 of this Act, and all notes and other evidences thereof and
25 all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Sec-

1 retary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruc-
2 tion Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or
3 in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation,
4 in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so
5 transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30,
6 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction
7 Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances
8 to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is
9 hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction
10 Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator,
11 in accordance with the provisions of this subsection 3 (a),
12 any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which
13 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been
14 authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For
15 the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this
16 section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use
17 as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of
18 any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act,
19 as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be
20 issued under that Act are extended to include such loans
21 or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Sec-
22 retary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be
23 treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.
24 "SEC. 3. (f) All moneys representing payments of prin-
25 cipal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall

1 be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans
2 made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance
3 Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the
4 payment of such loans all moneys representing payments
5 of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator
6 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

7 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses including personal services in
10 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed
11 $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members
12 of organizations at which matters of importance to the work
13 of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or
14 transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and news-
15 papers; library membership fees or dues in organizations
16 which issue publications to members only or to members at a
17 lower price than to others, payment for which may
18 be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures
19 authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12
20 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for
21 use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental
22 in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation
23 and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per
24 diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away
25 from their homes, without other compensation from the

1 United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit
2 Administration, except that such expenditures shall not ex-
3 ceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associa-
4 tions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by
5 the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000.
6 Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act
7 of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to
8 reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and
9 supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other
10 organizations as provided in said section.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under
13 this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses
14 of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau,
15 office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corpora-
16 tion, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes
17 or approves, or directs or authorizes the approval of, any
18 loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corpo-
19 ration of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such loan
20 or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security
21 for or assisting in the collection of a loan or advance thereto-
22 fore made by the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and
23 confined to a specific area or region in which the Secretary
24 of Agriculture shall have found that such loans for specified
25 agricultural purposes and for limited time periods are neces-

1 sary because of economic emergencies or production disasters.
2 All loans and advances made pursuant to this section will
3 carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be
4 secured by crops or livestock and such additional collateral
5 as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of re-
6 payment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal
7 of the loan or advance by a local bank or the production credit
8 association serving the area.

9 SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law
10 the lump-sum appropriations made for the Department under
11 this title shall be available for the purchase of passenger
12 motor vehicles, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary
13 in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the
14 District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles pur-
15 chased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the
16 Department for which appropriations are made under such
17 title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase
18 by the Department under the statements of proposed expendi-
19 tures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the
20 Budget.

21 SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
22 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
23 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
24 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emer-
25 gency of persons in the field service of the Department

1 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
2 under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricul-
3 tural Relations.

4 SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be avail-
5 able for health service programs as authorized by the Act
6 of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

7 SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to
8 the Department during the current fiscal year (except those
9 appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such
10 fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims
11 pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August
12 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

13 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in
14 this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
15 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
16 the United States or who is a member of an organization
17 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
18 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
19 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
20 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
21 force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof
22 an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that
23 the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
24 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
25 Government of the United States, is not a member of an

1 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
2 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
3 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
4 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
5 Government of the United States by force or violence:
6 *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory
7 employees of the Department as may be designated for the
8 purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to ad-
9 minister the oaths to persons making affidavits required by
10 this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing:
11 *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a
12 strike against the Government of the United States or who
13 is a member of an organization of Government employees
14 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of
15 the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member
16 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
17 Government of the United States by force or violence
18 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which
19 are paid from any appropriation contained in this title
20 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall
21 be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not
22 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
23 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
24 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
25 *vided further*, That nothing in this section shall be con-

1 strued to require an affidavit from any person employed
2 for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work in-
3 volving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
4 and payment of salary or wages may be made to such
5 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
6 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
7 templated by this section.

8 (54)*Sec. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for*
9 *personal services under appropriations in this Act shall*
10 *not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act*
11 *of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).*

12 Sec. (55)~~8~~ *9*. This Act may be cited as the "Depart-
13 ment of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

14 TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

15 Sec. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of
16 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for
17 the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal
18 year, namely:

19 Operating expenses: For operating and administrative
20 expenses, (56)~~$1,000,000~~ *$5,000,000*, including not to
21 exceed $700 for newspapers.

22 Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance
23 Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
24 subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop

1 Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of
2 the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504),
3 $10,000,000.

4 SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby au-
5 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of
6 funds and borrowing authority available to each such cor-
7 poration and in accord with law, and to make such contracts
8 and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations
9 as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation
10 Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs
11 set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each
12 such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

13 Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act
14 shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit
15 Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program
16 authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed
17 $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of
18 the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals,
19 maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for
20 penalty mail: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses
21 (including legal and special services performed on a contract
22 or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in
23 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance,
24 improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property

1 belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest,
2 including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall
3 be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes
4 hereof.

5 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided,* That no
6 part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title
7 shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than
8 the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as
9 authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of
10 insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat,
11 cotton, and flax (57): *Provided further, That none of the*
12 *funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948*
13 *or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred*
14 *and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-*
15 *seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of*
16 *the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five addi-*
17 *tional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a)*
18 *(2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in*
19 *not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed*
20 *fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation.*

21 SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions
22 specified under the head "General provisions" in the Govern-

1 ment Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be ap-
2 plicable to title II of this Act.

3 TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

4 EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF
5 AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

6 Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Pub-
7 lic Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved
8 August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition
9 612 (c)), not more than (58)~~$40,000,000~~ *$48,000,000*
10 shall be available during the fiscal year ending June 30,
11 1948, for use in effectuating the purposes of that Act.
12 (59)*To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of*
13 *the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law*
14 *396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds*
15 *appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the Act*
16 *approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such*
17 *amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limitation*
18 *contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds*
19 *expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9*
20 *of the National School Lunch Act.* The remainder of the
21 fund appropriated by said Act for the fiscal year 1948 is
22 hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be carried

1 to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately
2 thereafter.

Passed the House of Representatives May 28, 1947.

Attest: JOHN ANDREWS,
*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate with amendments July 14 (legislative day, July 10), 1947.

Attest: CARL A. LOEFFLER,
*Secretary.*

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3601

# AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 14, 1947

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
ivision of Legislative Reports
For Department staff only)

Issued July 16, 1947
For actions of July 15, 1947
80th-1st, No. 135

CONTENTS


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ricultural appropriation bill.....1 | Lands.....19 | Prices, support.....5 |
| propriations..1,2,13,14,17,18 | Lands, farm.....31 | Quarantine, plant.....6 |
| iry industry.....32 | Lands, reclamation.....11 | R.F.C.....22,25 |
| rm program.....24a | Legislative program.....21 | Regional authority.....34 |
| ood control.....28 | Loans, farm.....29,36 | Research.....9,15 |
| od, inspection.....26 | Marketing.....16,38 | Small business.....10,35 |
| reign affairs.....16 | Monopolies.....35 | Sugar.....21 |
| rests and forestry....3,8 | Peanuts.....7 | Water utilization.....33 |
| using.....21,23,37 | Personnel.....4,10,12,20 | Veterans' benefits.20,25,29,36 |
| | Prices.....27 | Wool.....5,30 |
| | Cooperatives.....4a | |


IGHLIGHTS: House sent agricultural appropriation bill to conference. House passed bill to permit agencies to meet payrolls for first half of July. House passed bill to permit sale of timber in Tongass Forest. House passed employees' loyalty bill. House committees reported wool bill without import-control provision, bill to limit entry of nursery stock, bill to amend various peanut-quota provisions, bill to abolish Jackson Hole Monument and return lands to Forest Service, and bill to change basis for 20% marketing-research requirement. Both Houses agreed to conference report on legislative appropriation bill. Rep. Hope introduced bill to authorize Agriculture Committee to investigate agricultural matters. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill. Sen. Williams said CCC was responsible for "technical corner" on wheat market and discussed Government marketing operations.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Dirksen, Plumley, Andersen, Horan, Phillips of Calif., Cannon, Whitten, and Sheppard were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 3601 (p. 9103). Senate conferees were appointed July 14.

2. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 240, which reads as follows: "Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to meet pay rolls (obligations for which were incurred in accordance with section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, Public Law 161) for pay periods ending prior to July 16, 1947: Provided, That expenditures hereunder shall be charged to the appropriate appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 when made" (p. 9117).

3. FORESTS. Passed as reported H. J. Res. 205, to authorize sale of timber in the Tongass National Forest, Alaska, in such a way as to facilitate pulp production in view of the aboriginal claims of Indians (p. 9094). A similar measure, S. J. Res. 118, has been reported in the Senate.

4. EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY. Passed, 319-61, with amendments H. R. 3813, which provides for a preliminary loyalty check on all Federal employees and job applicants by the Civil Service Commission and an investigation by FBI of adverse findings, prior to action by a 5-member Federal Loyalty Review Board, whose findings of fact are to be final (pp. 9118-56). A motion to recommit the bill to provide for appeal to the Court of Appeals was rejected 133-248.

4a. TVA COOPERATIVES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for liquidation of Tenn. Valley Coop. Inc., by USDA; to Agriculture Committee (p. 9163).

5. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1498, the wool bill which is the same as the vetoed bill except for elimination of the import-control provisions (H. Rept. 920)(p. 9163).

6. PLANT QUARANTINE. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments S. 338, to authorize USDA to limit importation of nursery stock to that needed for propagation and require that such stock be grown in post-entry quarantine to determine whether it is infested or infected (H. Rept. 921)(p. 9163).

7. PEANUT QUOTAS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4124, to amend peanut-quota provisions by providing that the farm marketing quota shall be the actual production of the farm acreage allotment and that no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm; by changing the excess-marketing penalty to 50% of the basic loan rate; and by making peanuts subject to quotas even though marketed before the beginning of the marketing year, with penalties for false statements regarding this (H. Rept. 922)(pp. 9163-4).

8. FORESTS. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1330, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument and return certain forest lands to the Forest Service (H. Rept. 914)(p. 9163).

9. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4110, which amends the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 by providing that not less than 20% of the funds "appropriated", rather than those "authorized to be appropriated", for general research shall be used by the State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research approved by the Department (H. Rept. 930)(p. 9164).

10. PERSONNEL. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. Con. Res. 14, favoring fair representation of small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointments (H. Rept. 929)(p. 9164).

11. RECLAMATION. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 244, for investigations looking to provision of additional water for southern Calif. and the Colo. River Basin (H. Rept. 916)(p. 9163).

This Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3834, to authorize a project for rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in N. Mex. (H. Rept. 924)(p. 9164).

12. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4127, the omnibus retirement bill (p. 9163).

13. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3993 (pp. 9069-70, 9109-10). This bill will now be sent to the President.

14. NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3493 (pp. 9070-1, 9104-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

15. RESEARCH. H.R. 4102, as reported (see Digest 131), creates a National Science Foundation of 24 members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for promotion of fundamental research and education in the sciences and to correlate its scientific programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; provides for an executive committee of the Foundation and a Director to be appointed by the Foundation; establishes an interdepartmental

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Eric Seddon as of June 26, 1946, and the said Eric Seddon shall, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Home Rule of the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet until 12 o'clock today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is the intention to go to conference today on the Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill, and if not, at what time conference will probably be held.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That matter is in process at the present time. It depends somewhat on the convenience of the Senate. We are endeavoring to arrange a conference. Possibly it will come tomorrow morning, as near as I can tell now.

Mr. CANNON. There is likelihood that the conference report on that bill can be filed during the current week?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We hope so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a series of resolutions adopted by the Manchester Post, American Legion.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, PLUMLEY, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, PHILLIPS of California, CANNON, WHITTEN, and SHEPPARD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in Committee of the Whole today and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD at this point.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House last week in passing the terminal-leave-pay bill was very generous and proved the deep appreciation felt by the people of this country for the service rendered by members of the armed forces. But this action has not relieved the country of its full responsibility for consideration of the needs of our veterans. At the opening session of this Congress when our committee began to hold hearings on the various bills that were presented, the fact became apparent that one of the most pressing problems of veterans at this time was the need for increased subsistence allowance for veterans who are continuing their education under the GI bill of rights. At that time I was inclined to oppose any such increase, however at this time I am wholeheartedly in favor of the increase proposed by the action of the Veterans Committee.

My changed attitude is the result of the close study given to the proposal by the Subcommittee on Education and Rehabilitation. Many student veterans appeared before the subcommittee to testify, and in addition, I was fortunate in having informal conversations with these young men and women at their schools. I wish to say that my contacts with these students impressed me deeply. Their sincerity of purpose in continuing their education, their devotion to their country and its Government, their fundamental belief and faith in our economic system of free enterprise and their desire to take their place within its framework—all these impressions left me with the conviction that any investment we make now in their future will be repaid to their Government and to their country with untold extra dividends.

I am proud to report to you that the vast majority have an instinctive dislike of being considered Government charges. Their sentiment and predisposition toward independence is very strong. They did not ask originally for the GI bill of rights, but they are grateful for the opportunity the provisions of this bill has given them; a majority indicated that without it, they would not have been able to continue their studies. And yet, it is an unfortunate fact that at the present time, many are being forced to discontinue their studies simply because their income is not, even with the aid of the subsistence allowance, sufficient to meet their expenses.

One immediate reaction to such a statement is that the veteran should act independently to raise his income to meet his needs. But many are doing just that, and are still unable to meet their financial requirements. The reason lies in a variety of factors, including the period when most of them have been in school, in the great numbers of students enrolled who want outside employment, in the keen competition among the students and the raising of standards by many schools, and in others which I shall discuss.

The increased cost of living needs little further discussion at this time to this House to indicate its importance and how it has made so desperate the plight of low-income groups. The gentlewoman from California dramatically illustrated not long ago in this House the effect of the increase on the price of food. I do not now propose to discuss why prices are high. I do point out that one of the most inequitable and harmful results of high prices is that the student veteran's income is insufficient to cover his expenses, and it is a result which we, as Members of this Congress, are in a position to remedy. It is well for us to remember during this discussion that the present cost of staying in college is now almost double the same cost in 1939—and many times greater than college expenses of most Members when they were students.

Not only are all costs much higher, but the competition for the various jobs available is much keener. We are all aware that the average college is located in a relatively small town which boasts few industries. Due to the limitations of time and space, the student seeking employment usually works either for the school or in some small establishment offering services to the other students. Class schedules prevent working full time during the usual hours of employment. And nothing new is revealed when I point out that the wage scale for this intermittent employment is well below the national average.

Related closely to the general problem, of great importance in this discussion, is a consideration which has received much too little attention when its true effect is recognized. Basically, it is the fact that the enlarged enrollment has presented the schools an opportunity to raise their standards without affecting enrollment, and the raising of standards increases the amount of time required for preparation of classroom work. This is not to be understood as criticism of

the schools themselves; it is merely a statement of fact as much the result of the desire of the mature veteran student to take advantage of his opportunity as of the natural desire of the school to set and maintain a high degree of scholarship. Whatever the cause, the time for outside employment, if it could be found, has been proportionately lessened.

What I have just discussed is applicable alike to single and married students, indicating that the difficulties are general, not isolated to certain campuses or certain types of students. Further indicated is a potent argument for increase regardless of marital status. But it is well recognized that the difficulties of the single student are not as pressing and grave as those of the married student veteran; it is at once obvious that the responsibility of maintaining a home and a family magnifies the difficulty in this matter of school expense.

Rents, as we all know, are not low, even when housing can be obtained; in the future they will be at least 15 percent higher in many instances. Far too often exhorbitant rents are charged for totally inadequate housing. It is true that many colleges have attacked this problem frontally, have made much progress in obtaining the necessary housing for their veteran students. But there are still far too many married students—and single students, too—whose housing situation is desperate. This factor, coupled with the high prices previously mentioned, disillusions the married veteran, and has forced far too many of them to discontinue their education. Particularly is this true in the case of the married veteran who is also a parent. It is impossible for his wife to assist him with the family income, as it sometimes is possible when there are no children.

On this subject of the wife working, I have been appalled to hear callous statements to the effect that the married veteran should not be having a hard time because is wife should be helping him. It is basically wrong for us to assume that the wife has duty to help support the family. The choice of working should be hers, but the duty should not. Her moral support of her husband, her obligation for management of the home—though I refer to home-making with a realization that some of the so-called houses have few of the attributes which the men who fought this war expected to be forced to call homes—are full-time tasks and all her Government has a right to assume she should do. Her prime responsibility at this early period of her married life is the maintenance of her home and care of children. By so doing, she assists immeasurably in solving one of our major problems today—the battle against juvenile delinquency and its attendant evils, by by-products of economic desperation and the lack of a well-integrated home unit. So, any suggestion that the student veteran's wife should work has no place in this discussion, as a factor to influence our action, except insofar as it indicates that the subsistence allowance should be raised.

It is now appropriate to consider the position of the Government. The action by the Congress in passing the GI bill of rights will live long as one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation ever formulated. The legislation reflects the desire of a grateful people to reward the men and women, who, by their valor and sacrifice preserved this Government from a powerful enemy. The reward was of a practical nature, designed to assist those who chose to accept it in the complicated business of demobilization and return to civilian life. But the phase with which we are presently concerned is the opportunity to continue an interrupted education. This particular educational reward was complemented by providing "on-the-job training" to reach the situation of every veteran. But, most significant, the legislation was neither requested nor demanded by the men and women it benefits.

What is important now is what the veteran who accepts the benefits offered was led to understand at the time of making that acceptance, from a financial point of view. Obviously, it was not that the Government proposed to subsidize his whole education. But, the general understanding is that the $65 and the $90 as authorized by the GI bill was intended to defray the very basic and necessary expenses as of the time it was passed. In other words, the veteran entered school believing that the allowance was designed to defray the essential expenses, based on a standard set at the time the bill was passed. Having made this offer upon which he relied, there is an obligation—a very real moral obligation to which we cannot be blind—upon the Government to see that the serious unbalance caused by inflation does not make the gift a hollow one.

The stark fact facing us is that the gift is hollow for too many of those who relied upon its adequacy. Some, without outside help upon which to rely, have been forced to leave school, their education incomplete and their savings depleted seriously or gone in a vain attempt to remain. Too many of those who do remain will leave their school as graduates with few pleasant memories, with a sense of having been let down, and with seriously depleted savings—unless we act to remedy the situation by increasing the allowances now in effect.

Political considerations should not be allowed to intrude on the consideration of a problem so important as this, just as politics were forgotten during the war. After all, we are dealing with a situation which is an aftermath of that war, posing one question and one answer. The question is, Shall we act with a sense of responsibility toward the Government's investment in the student veteran's future, realizing what was offered by the legislation upon which he relied and the inadequacy of that legislation in the light of the present economic situation? The only answer is in the affirmative.

That answer should be even more emphatically affirmative when we remember that our keystone of democratic liberty is an enlightened citizenry. That answer should be emphatically in the affirmative because a contract made by the Government is at stake, it would ill become this Congress to break the faith which is represented in that contract. Let us, then, show our faith with financial assistance to those men who showed their faith in us by their blood, sweat, toil, and tears. We shall have shirked a duty if we do less.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. H. 3493, a bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and naval services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 11, 1947.)

Mr. PLUMLEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this report was printed in the RECORD of Friday, July 11, 1947, and has been available to the Members for 3 days. I suggest that there is no necessity for continuing the reading of the statement, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the amount provided for research in the Navy Department?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to answer that question in my general statement in discussion of the bill as a whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department appropriation bill for 1948, as it comes out of conference, carries total new appropriations of $3,268,766,100, which is $133,285,000 more than the amount which was approved as the House passed the bill on May 20, and is $43,278,200 below the amount as it passed the Senate. In addition, transfers were authorized of approximately $164,000,000.

However, the House Conferees have agreed to the proposal of the Senate to rescind a total of $403,575,000 of 1946 and 1947 funds, a large portion of which would have been spent had it not been for the rescission in title II in the pending bill. It is estimated that at least $161,000,000 of the rescissions represents an actual reduction in the program and the balance, $242,575,000 is in a large amount composed of funds that probably would have lapsed into the Treasury in any event.

Assuming that only the $161,000,000 was a program reduction, we thus have a situation where the conference report provides an eventual expenditure of about $28,000,000 less than would have

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 18, 1947
For actions of July 17, 1947
80th-1st, No. 137

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations..1,2,3,18,39,40
Cotton.....38
Drainage.....13
Economic report.....37
Fertilizers.....30
Flood control.....8,34
Foreign affairs.....10,33
Forests & forestry.11,13,15
Health.....10
Housing.....28
Labor, farm.....21,26
Lands.....12,22
Lands, reclamation.....13
Livestock and meat.....6,30
Minerals..... 7
Monopolies.....31
Personnel.....17,19,35
Prices.....24
Property, surplus..... 9
Quarantine, animal..... 6
R.F.C.....25,27
Research.....4,32
Roads.....23
Soil conservation.....30
Standard of living.....38
Statistics.....16
Subsidies.....20
Sugar.....14,36
Trade, foreign.....36
Transportation.....17
Veterans.....12,25,27,29
War powers..... 5
Wildlife.....9,11

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. House sent Government corporations appropriation bill to conference. Rep. Gillie inserted and discussed subcommittee report criticizing administration of foot-and-mouth disease campaign. House passed bill repealing numerous war and emergency powers. Senate committee reported bill to amend and extend Sugar Act. House received President's appropriation estimate for flood control. Senate passed over, on objection, measure to permit timber sales in Tongass Forest. Rep. Bramblett introduced bill to donate farm-labor camps. President approved bill to permit salary payments pending appropriations and legislative appropriation bill.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 9369-72). The report is tentatively scheduled to be considered today.

The following items were among those reported in disagreement: Agricultural conservation program, school lunch program, farm-tenant loans, meat inspection, section 32, and penalty mail.

The conference report provides for $225,000,000 for rural-electrification loans, $5,000,000 for crop-insurance administration, $9,000,000 for Research and Marketing Act with changes in items, $2,125,000 for the Solicitor's Office, $2,000,000 for BAE economic investigations, $503,000 for OFAR, $5,000,000 for REA salaries and expenses, $1,000,000 for flood control.

(A more detailed statement will be sent to you later today.)

2. GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Ploeser, Jensen, Schwabe of Okla., Coudert, Mahon, Gore, and Whitten were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 3756 (p. 9353). Senate conferees were appointed July 16.

3. DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL. Rep. Taber, N. Y., obtained unanimous consent that the new deficiency bill, which will probably be reported today, may be taken up immediately and that points of order be waived (p. 9369).

4. RESEARCH. Reps. Wolverton, Hinshaw, Howell, Priest, and Harris were appointed conferees on S. 526, to create a National Science Foundation (p. 9373). Senate conferees were also appointed as follows: Sens. Taft, Aiken, Smith, Thomas of Utah, and Ellender (p. 9295). The bill as passed by the House is printed in the Record (pp. 9292-5).

5. WAR POWERS. Passed with amendments S. J. Res. 123, to repeal certain war and emergency powers (pp. 9373-7). A list of items of interest to this Department will appear in tomorrow's Digest.

6. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. Rep. Gillie, Ind., inserted and discussed the report of his subcommittee on the foot-and-mouth disease campaign in Mexico. The report recommends (1) that operations be speeded up, (2) that funds be made available immediately to enable the campaign to be pursued at the highest speed and intensity, (3) that there be created the office of executive director to have charge of the entire campaign, (4) that the campaign be carried on on its present basis south of the Tampico-Colima military quarantine line, (5) that USDA immediately assign the best man available to get existing packing plants in northern Mexico into operations, etc., and (6) that all infected or exposed animals be killed and buried as rapidly as possible. (pp. 9378-81.)

7. MINERALS. Debated H. R. 1602, to provide for a National Minerals Resources Division in the Interior Department (pp. 9383-97).

8. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the President's supplemental appropriation estimates for flood control, totaling $250,000,000, of which $3,000,000 would be for SCS (H. Doc. 406); to Appropriations Committee (p. 9399).

9. WILDLIFE CONSERVATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendments H. R. 4018, authorizing transfer of surplus property from Government agencies to the Interior Department for wildlife-conservation purposes (H. Rept. 972)(p. 9399).

10. HEALTH; FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendments H.J.Res. 161, providing for U.S. membership and participation in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor (H.Rept. 979) (p. 9399).

11. WILDLIFE; NATIONAL FORESTS. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment S. 616, to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest, S.C. (H.Rept. 980) (p. 9399).

12. LANDS; VETERANS. H.R. 4059, as reported (see Digest 136), provides for the homesteading of certain lands in Alaska by veterans; authorizes claims of not less than 320 acres or more than 1920 acres and for such purposes as agriculture, fur farming, grazing, timber or any combination of these types; requires a habitable dwelling before patent is issued; prohibits sale or lease of the land during a five-year period after the patent is issued except under specified conditions; provides that USDA forestry practices requiring that all timberland be maintained on a sustained-yield basis shall be continued in perpetuity; and authorizes loans on improvements on the land before patent is issued.

13. DRAINAGE INVESTIGATIONS. H.R. 3538, as reported (see Digest 136), authorizes the Agriculture Department to investigate, plan, design, and report to the President and Congress on proposed projects for reclaiming land by drainage. The bill, as originally introduced, would give this responsibility to the Interior Department. The Committee also amended the bill to assure that no recommendation is made for drainage of an area unless it is shown that the benefits to local, State, or Federal governments exceed the cost of the project, to provide that flood control remain under the War Department, and to prohibit the Agriculture Department from making an investigation in irrigation districts adjacent to Federal irrigation projects.

Conference Report — Agricultural Appropriation Bill, 1948
[Reported July 17, 1947]
Funds and Principal Language Changes

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases: Senate Compared with House | Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | PENALTY MAIL | +$300,000 | *- - |
| | RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946: | | |
| 2 | Payments to State Agricultural Experiment Stations (Sec. 9, Title I of the Act) | -500,000 | -$500,000 |
| 3 | Provision inserted by House authorizing such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska to be transferred to the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska" without matching requirements | Senate struck | Senate recedes |
| | Provision amending Sec. 11 of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 relating to the earmarking of Sec. 9 funds for Marketing research by striking out "authorized to be appropriated under Section 9(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "appropriated pursuant to Section 9(a)." | Senate inserted | Senate recedes |
| 4 | Utilization research (Sec. 10(a), Title I of the Act) | +500,000 | +500,000 |
| 5 | Marketing research and services (Title II of the Act) | +500,000 | - - |
| 6 | Total for Research and Marketing Act | +500,000 | -)+ |
| 7 | Senate struck provision inserted by House prohibiting use of these funds for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof. Conferees restored House language and added at the end the following "except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates". | | |
| | OFFICE OF SOLICITOR: | | |
| 8 | Salaries and expenses | +200,000 | +100,000 |
| 9 | D. C. Salary limitation | -97,000 | -97,000 |
| | OFFICE OF INFORMATION: | | |
| 10 | Printing and binding: | | |
| | Provision inserted by House authorizing necessary funds for printing and binding in connection | | |

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases: Senate compared with House | Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| | OFFICE OF INFORMATION - Cont. | | |
| | Printing and binding: - Cont. | | |
| | with administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 ..... | Senate struck | House agrees |
| | Provision authorizing necessary funds for printing and binding in connection with Section 32 activities ..... | Senate inserted | House agrees |
| 11 | Total amount authorized to be transferred... | +$74,700 | +$49,700 |
| | BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS: | | |
| 12 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +500,000 | +256,400 |
| 13 | Economic investigations ..... | +500,000 | +256,400 |
| 14 | OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS, Salaries and expenses ..... | +150,000 | +75,000 |
| | RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA: | | |
| 15 and 16 | House inserted language and an appropriation of $144,940 for this item. This amount included $44,940 for which a corresponding reduction was made in the appropriation for payments to the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell and Bankhead-Jones Acts. House Bill also authorized transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture of necessary equipment, facilities, buildings, etc. of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station together with certain unexpended balances of funds. Senate deleted latter authorization, restored the Budget estimate of $44,940 for payments to the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station and retained $100,000 appropriation to the Secretary for research on agricultural problems of Alaska. Conferees struck the Senate provision and restored House language with amendments (1) that the same shall be effective until June 30, 1949 and (2) that "The Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land grant college acts." | | |

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases | Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| | BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY: | | |
| 17 | D. C. Salary limitation | +$2,840 | * |
| 18 | Meat inspection | +6,140,000 | * |
| 19 | Provision inserted by House establishing a working capital fund which would be reimbursed by the packers for the full cost of meat inspection required under the Federal Meat Inspection laws | Senate struck | * |
| 20 | Virus Serum Toxin Act | +50,000 | +$25,000 |
| | BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY: | | |
| 21 | D. C. Salary limitation | +40,912 | +40,912 |
| | BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING: | | |
| 22 | Diseases of young natural stands and plantations (House eliminated entire project; Senate restoration applies particularly to chestnut diseases, with authority to redistribute entire appropriation for forest diseases.) | | |
| 23 | Soil improvement, management, and irrigation investigations | +75,000 | +75,000 |
| | Fertilizers and their improvement | +25,000 | - - |
| | BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE: | | |
| 24 | D. C. Salary limitation | +66,688 | +53,350 |
| 25, Part I | Pink bollworm and thurberia weevil control | +250,000 | +225,000 |
| 25, Part II | Dutch elm disease control | +100,000 | +50,000 |
| | BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS: | | |
| 26 | D. C. Salary limitation | -76,700 | -76,700 |
| 27 | Salaries and expenses | -245,000 | -245,000 |

(Continued on next page)

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases: Senate compared with House | Increases and decreases: Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| | FOREST SERVICE: | | |
| 28 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +28,000 | +28,000 |
| 29 | National forest protection and management (Unit management). Conference report does not ratify the earmarking of $25,000 for Lake Tahoe recreation area as provided in Senate Report No. 474. Conference report provides that this expenditure may be made at the discretion of the Forest Service out of any funds available for expenditures of this character... | +250,000 | +250,000 |
| 30 | Forest products ..... | +250,000 | +250,000 |
| 31 | Forest survey ..... | +250,000 | +250,000 |
| 32 | Acquisition of lands for national forests ..... | +250,000 | +250,000 |
| 33 | House inserted provision that amount was to be used only for purchase price of land. Senate struck House provision and inserted language providing that administrative cost of acquisition is to be met from the appropriation "National forest protection and management". Conferees struck the Senate provision and restored House language amended to add the following: "including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition". | | |
| | FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS: | | |
| 34 | Forest development roads ..... | +1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| 35 | Forest highways ..... | +3,000,000 | - - |
| 36 | Total for forest roads and trails . | +4,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| 37 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +9,530 | - - |
| 38 | FLOOD CONTROL ..... | +1,000,000 | +500,000 |
| 39 | Provision inserted by House providing that allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvements on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations | | |

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases: Senate compared with House | Increases and decreases: Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| | FLOOD CONTROL - Continued | | |
| | Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances .. ..... | Senate struck | Senate recedes |
| | Language providing that additional amount (Senate Bill, $1,000,000; Conference Report, $500,000) shall be used to make preliminary examinations and surveys in the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries ..... | Senate inserted | House agrees |
| | SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE: | | |
| 40 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +36,500 | +18,250 |
| 41 | Soil conservation research ..... | +750,000 | +375,000 |
| 42 | CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES: | | * |
| | Appropriation total ..... | +92,385,710 | |
| | Administrative expenses: | | |
| | State and national ..... | [+5,130,813] | |
| | County associations ..... | [+7,369,187] | |
| | Provision to include the expenses of the peanut-marketing quota program in the limitation for salaries and expenses ..... | Senate inserted | |
| | Provision excepting from the salaries and expenses limitation the cost of aerial photographs ..... | Senate inserted | |
| | House inserted provision directing the Secretary to accept certificates from claimants as proof of performance. Senate makes this provision optional. | | |
| | House eliminated Budget provision for a $200,000,000 program for 1948. Senate inserted provision for a $150,000,000 program. | | |
| | Provision requiring that program payments for 1948 crop year must be distributed to the States on the basis of conservation needs, provided that the proportion received by any State would not be reduced by more than 15 per cent below 1946..... | Senate inserted | |
| | Provision limiting to $500 the amount of payments received by any participant for the 1948 crop year ..... | Senate inserted | |

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decrease: Senate compared with House | Conferenc Report compared with House Bil |
|---|---|---|---|
| | CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES: Continued | | |
| | Provision inserted by House for reapportioning any funds in excess of requirements for farmer participation in the program in any State, region or area, to other States, regions, or areas where original apportionments have not been sufficient to meet requirements . ..... | Senate struck | |
| 43 and 59 | NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT ..... | +30,000,000 | * |
| | Senate struck language providing a direct appropriation of $45,000,000 for the school lunch program as well as House provision prohibiting the use of the proceeds from the sale of lunches for matching purposes, and inserted language authorizing use of $75,000,000 of Section 32 funds for this program ..... | Senate inserted | * |
| 44 | ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS ..... | -525,300 | -525,300 |
| | As a result of House Committee recommendation for rescission of Section 32 funds, a new item was inserted for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. This item was deleted by the Senate as this work is provided for under the increased amount in the Senate Bill for Section 32 purposes .. | Senate struck | House agrees |
| | MARKETING SERVICES: | | |
| 45 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +75,000 | - - |
| 46 and 47 | Market news service ..... | +38,750 | +38,750 |
| | Language revised by adding "including poultry" ..... | Senate inserted | House agrees |
| 48 | Marketing farm products (food production and marketing assistance) ..... | +100,000 | - - |
| | COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY: | | |
| 49 | D. C. Salary limitation ..... | +12,000 | +12,000 |
| | FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION: | | |
| 50 | Farm tenant loans ..... | +20,000,000 | * |
| 51 | Salaries and expenses ..... | +6,000,000 | +3,000,000 |

| Amendment No. | Item | Increases and decreases: Senate compared with House | Increases and decreases: Conference Report compared with House Bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| | RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION: | | |
| 52 | Salaries and expenses ..... | +1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| 53 | Loans (authorization to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury) ..... | +25,000,000 | - - |
| | GENERAL PROVISIONS: | | |
| 54 | Language provisions (new Sec. 8) waiving personal services limitations contained in the Agricultural Appropriation Act to the extent necessary to make lump-sum, terminal leave payments to employees ..... | Senate inserted | * |
| | The Conference report states that "the managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment inserting new language at the end of the Senate amendment, as follows: 'Provided, That in expending the appropriation herein for "Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry," service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947'". | | |
| 55 | Senate changed Sec. 8 to Sec. 9 because of inserting a new Sec. 8 ..... | | House agrees |
| | FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION: | | |
| 56 | Operating expenses ..... | +4,000,000 | +4,000,000 |
| 57 | Language provision restricting the crop insurance program for 1948 and subsequent crop years to wheat, flax, and five additional crops, including corn, tobacco, and cotton in a limited number of counties, on an experimental basis. The Conference report states that the managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur, and that the proviso inserted by the Senate is considered by the managers to be purely a limitation on the 1948 program and is not intended to be prejudicial to future legislation. | Senate inserted | * |
| | EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES: | | |
| 58 | For Section 32 purposes ..... | +8,000,000 | +4,000,000 |
| 59 | Language provision making available a total of $75,000,000 from 1948 Section 32 funds for National School Lunch Act..... | Senate inserted | * |

*Reported in disagreement.

Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance
Division of Estimates and Allotments

Jonkman
Kearns
Keefe
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kunkel
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
LeFevre
Love
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Maloney
Manasco
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morris
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Pace
Passman
Peden
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Poage
Potts
Preston
Price, Fla.
Priest
Rains
Ramey
Rayburn
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Rizley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rohrbough
Ross
Schwabe, Okla.
Scrivner
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomason
Tibbott
Towe
Vorys
Wadsworth
Weichel
West
Wheeler
Whittington
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wood
Woodruff

NAYS—188

Abernethy
Andersen, H. Carl
Angell
Arnold
Auchincloss
Banta
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Blatnik
Bloom
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Buchanan
Burke
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Canfield
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Celler
Chiperfield
Clason
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Corbett
Crawford
Crosser
Cunningham
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dondero
Donohue
Douglas
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Flannagan
Fogarty
Foote
Forand
Fulton
Gearhart
Gordon
Gorski
Granger
Griffiths
Hagen
Hale
Hand
Hart
Havenner
Heffernan
Hendricks
Herter
Heselton
Hoeven
Holmes
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jenkins, Pa.
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kennedy
Keogh
Kersten, Wis.
King
Klein
Knutson
Landis
Lane
LeCompte
Lemke
Lesinski
Lewis
Lodge
Lusk
Lynch
McCormack
McGarvey
McMahon
Mack
MacKinnon
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Konski
Owens
Patterson
Peterson
Pfeifer
Philbin
Pickett
Poulson
Price, Ill.
Rabin
Rankin
Rayfiel
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reeves
Robsion
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Russell
Sabath
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Scoblick
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Somers
Spence
Stratton
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vursell
Walter
Welch
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Worley
Youngblood
Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Keating

NOT VOTING—38

Andresen, August H.
Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Boggs, La.
Buckley
Chadwick
Clements
Clippinger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Coudert
Fuller
Gifford
Gwynne, Iowa
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ohio
Kee
Kelley
Kirwan
Lea
Ludlow
Macy
Murdock
O'Toole
Patman
Phillips, Calif.
Powell
Riley
Rivers
Scott, Hardie
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Snyder
Vinson

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Kelley against.
Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Holifield against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Ohio with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Clements.

Mr. NODAR, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Mr. SANBORN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide the venue in actions brought in the United States district courts or in State courts against interstate common carriers by railroad for damages for wrongful death or personal injuries."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the deficiency bill is reported it may be in order to take it up forthwith, whenever possible; that all points of order may be considered as waived; that general debate shall continue for not to exceed 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill carrying funds for the Greek and Turkish loan, and for foreign relief?

Mr. TABER. Yes, it is.

Mr. CANNON. The items in the bill which would be subject to points of order are necessary for the adequate administration of the appropriation?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. We have no objection on this side, Mr. Speaker, to any action to expedite consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 4, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HARTLEY, Mr. LANDIS, Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. MCCOWEN, Mr. LESINSKI, Mr. BARDEN, and Mr. KELLEY.

NATIONAL AVIATION COUNCIL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3587, an act to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOWELL, Mr. BULWINKLE, and Mr. PRIEST.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Agriculture Department appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3601.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us when it is expected to call up this conference report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The first thing tomorrow morning. It is my understanding that the House will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON. The conference report will be the first order of business on Friday morning?

Mr. DIRKSEN. So I am presently advised. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 16, 35, 37, 45, 48, and 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert ", except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,143,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$503,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

Page 18, line 18, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "hereof," insert the following: "until June 30, 1949,".

Page 19, line 14, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "transfer" and the period insert the following: "The Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land grant college acts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,466,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$745,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment if the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,972,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ", to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances: *Provided further*, That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$856,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43, 50, 54, 57, and 59.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

PENALTY MAIL

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: Reported in disagreement.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ("HOPE-FLANNAGAN") ACT

Amendment No. 2, payments to States, etc., for agricultural experiment stations: House appropriated $3,000,000; Senate, $2,500,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 3, Alaska allotment under amendment No. 2: Strikes out the House language transferring such allotment to the appropriation, "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska." Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4, for research on utilization and associated problems pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act: House appropriated $2,500,000; Senate, $3,000,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 5, for distribution and marketing studies: The House appropriated $2,000,000; the Senate, $2,500,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 6 relates to a total. Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Restores the House provision stricken out by the Senate "That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof" and adds the following: "except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates."

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 8, for salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $2,025,000; the Senate, $2,225,000; the conferees have agreed to $2,125,000.

Amendment No. 9, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,597,000; the Senate, $1,500,000; the House recedes.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 10: The House provided for the transfer to the appropriation for printing and binding from funds appropriated "for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection therewith." The Senate struck out the House provision and inserted "to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: The House authorized transfers of $95,300 from certain general appropriations to the appropriation for printing and binding. The Senate authorized $170,000. The conferees have agreed upon $145,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 12: Relates to limitation on expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia: Adjusted to conform to action on amendment No. 13.

Amendment No. 13, economic investigations: The House appropriated $1,743,600; the Senate, $2,243,600; the conferees have agreed upon $2,000,000.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Amendment No. 14, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $428,000; the Senate,

$578,000; the conferees have agreed upon $503,000.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA AND OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: The House provided for an appropriation of $144,940 together with all Territorial funds available for the Territorial Agricultural Experiment Station for a research program under the exclusive supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture, requiring the University of Alaska to make available to the Secretary all of the lands, buildings, and equipment heretofore used by the university in connection with the experiment station. The House omitted from the appropriation for payments to the States and Territories in connection with the several land-grant college acts the amount set up in the Budget for Alaska, namely, $44,940, and included that sum in the total of $144,940 appropriated by the House for "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska." By amendment No. 15, the Senate struck out all of the House language and by amendment No. 16 inserted new language restoring the Alaska allotment of $44,940 to the appropriation for payments to States and Territories, and providing an appropriation of $100,000 for "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska" under the Secretary of Agriculture. The combined effect of Senate amendments Nos. 15 and 16 restored to the University of Alaska possession and control of the lands, buildings, and equipment belonging to the experiment station and all funds of said station, while authorizing the Department of Agriculture to use its appropriation of $100,000 for the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities.

The Senate recedes from its amendment No. 16 and agrees to the House provision, stricken out by Senate amendment No. 15, with an amendment providing that the same shall be effective until June 30, 1949, and that the Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress and agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land-grant college acts.

The conferees of both Houses wish to emphasize that the provision agreed to does not reflect any intention to depart from or modify the long established policy of providing for research through grants to the States and Territories under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts, or to initiate a policy of taking over the State experiment stations. The provision agreed to relating to Alaska is to be regarded as of a temporary nature, pending the correction of a serious administrative deficiency in the past conduct of the research at this station. It is the purpose of the conferees that control and operation of the station by the University shall be restored as soon as conditions warrant.

Research in Alaska by the Department of Agriculture, independent of or in cooperation with the university experiment station, as may be provided, will continue, of course, beyond June 30, 1949 to the extent Congress may deem it wise to make appropriations therefor.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 17: Relates to a limitation on the amount which may be spent for personal services in the District of Columbia, which will be adjusted to conform to action taken on the amendments relating to the several work programs.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19 relating to meat inspection: This item is in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20, Virus Serum Toxin Act: The House appropriated $290,000; the Senate, $340,000; the conferees have agreed upon $315,000.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 21, salaries and expenses: This amendment relates to the amount which may be spent for personal services in the District of Columbia. The House provided $500,000; the Senate, $540,912; the House recedes.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 22, forest diseases: The House appropriated $359,280; the Senate $379,280; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 23, soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: The House appropriated $1,391,000; the Senate $1,491,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,466,000. The increase of $75,000 over the amount appropriated by the House is for the purpose of keeping open the six stations which would otherwise be closed under the House amount.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 24, relating to expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $692,000; the Senate $758,688; the conferees have agreed upon $745,350.

Amendment No. 25, insect and plant disease control: The House provided $51,800 for dutch elm disease; the Senate provided $151,800; the conferees have agreed upon $101,800. The House provided $499,000 for pink boll worm control; the Senate provided $749,000; the conferees have agreed upon $724,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $1,045,000; the Senate $800,000; the House recedes.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 28, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,055,378; the Senate $1,083,378; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 29, National forest protection and management: The House appropriated $23,764,891; the Senate $24,014,891; the House recedes. In approving the full amount of the Senate increase the conferees of both Houses have agreed that the earmarking of $25,000 for Lake Tahoe recreation area contained in Senate Report No. 474 is not ratified by this report. It is believed however that this expenditure may be made by the forest service in the discretion of that agency out of any funds available for an expenditure of this character in the event it elects so to do.

Amendment No. 30, forest products; the House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate $1,250,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 31, forest resources investigations: The House appropriated $572,000; the Senate $822,000; the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33, acquistion of lands for national forests: The House appropriated $500,000; the Senate $750,000; the House recedes with the provision that the money is "to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisitions."

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Amendment No. 34, forest development roads and trails: The House appropriated $10,000,000; the Senate $11,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 35, forest highways: The House appropriated $5,300,000; the Senate, $8,300,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 36, relating to a total, has been appropriately adjusted.

Amendment No. 37, relating to expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $100,000; the Senate, $109,530; the Senate recedes.

FLOOD CONTROL

Amendment No. 38, flood control: The House appropriated $500,000; the Senate $1,500,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,000,000.

Amendment No. 39: Restores the House provision stricken out by the Senate "That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances" and retains the provision inserted by the Senate amended to read "That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries."

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 40, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $838,500; the Senate $875,000; the conferees have agreed upon $856,750.

Amendment No. 41, soil conservation research: The House appropriated $673,000; the Senate $1,423,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,048,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 42: In disagreement.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Amendment No. 43, for the National School Lunch Act: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

Amendment No. 44, relating to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act: The House appropriated $525,300; the Senate struck out the item; the House recedes. Expenses necessary for the administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act during the fiscal year 1948 will be available within the administrative expenses limitation under the section 32 appropriation entitled "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural comm dities".

MARKETING SERVICES

Amendment No. 45, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $2,211,000; the Senate, $2,286,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the Market News Service appropriation: The Senate inserted the words "including broilers" in the language text referring to Market News on poultry products. This insertion is merely interpretive language with reference to poultry products. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 47, Market News Service: The House appropriated $1,527,500; the Senate, $1,566,250; The House recedes.

Amendment No. 48, marketing farm products: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,100,000; the Senate recedes.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 49, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The Hous provided $141,000; the Senate, $153,000; the House recedes.

FARMER'S HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 50, loans under title I and section 43, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 51, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $18,000,000; the Senate, $24,000,000; the conferees have agreed to $21,000,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 52, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $4,000,000; the Senate, $5,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 53, loan funds: The House authorized $225,000,000 to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose; the Senate, $250,000,000; the Senate recedes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 54, relating to the waiving of limitations on personal service expenditures to permit lump sum terminal leave payments: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 55, changing a section number: The House recedes.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 56, operating expenses, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $5,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the scope of the crop-insurance program: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

*Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities*

Amendment No. 58, section 32 funds: The House provided that not more than $40,000,000 of such funds shall be available during the fiscal year 1948 for effectuating the purposes of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended; the Senate, $48,000,000; the conferees have agreed to $44,000,000.

Amendment No. 59, providing for the school-lunch program to be financed during the fiscal year 1948 with section 32 funds: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: The House appropriated $3,186,000; the Senate $3,486,000. Action on this amendment will depend upon action taken on the several amendments in disagreement requiring allotments for penalty mail.

Amendment No. 17: A District of Columbia salary limitation.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, meat-inspection: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for the initial contribution to the "Meat-inspection fund." The House provided that hereafter all expenses of the meat-inspection service shall be paid from the "Meat-inspection fund" and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter assess and collect fees from the meat packers based upon the cost of the inspection, such fees to be paid into the "Meat-inspection fund." The Senate has stricken out the House provision relating to the "Meat-inspection fund" and the assessing of the packers for the cost of meat inspection and has provided the budget estimate of $11,140,000 for meat-inspection service. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 42, soil conservation payments: The House appropriated $165,614,290 for the 1947 crop year program and included a provision that no soil conservation payments program may be planned for the crop year 1948. The Senate struck out the House provision and provided a total of $295,635,044 for the 1947 crop program and authorized a program for the crop year 1948 in the total sum of $150,000,000. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 59, National School Lunch Act: The House appropriated $45,000,000 and provided "That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches." The Senate struck out the House provision by amendment No. 43 and inserted new language by amendment No. 59 providing for the expenditure of $75,000,000 for the program from section 32 funds, with no limitation prohibiting the use of funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 50, farm-tenant loans: The House made no provision; the Senate appropriated $20,000,000. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 54, Sec. 8: The Senate inserted language providing that "limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525)." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment inserting new language at the end of the Senate amendment, as follows: "Provided, That in expending the appropriation herein for 'Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry,' service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947."

Amendment No. 57, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: The Senate inserted the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur. The proviso inserted by the Senate is considered by the managers to be purely a limitation on the 1948 program and is not intended to be prejudicial to future legislation.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

AMENDING ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1448, an act to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment, which is simply a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 10, after "dwellings", insert "nor, for a rooming house offering accommodations for no more than four roomers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois in connection with the Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill conference report if he can advise the House what specific matters are still in disagreement and will come up on specific questions tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure that the chairman of the committee is empowered with authority to make such a statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Very well, I withdraw it. I appreciate the gentleman's position. I would not want to ask the gentleman any question that he feels, under the circumstances he could not, without consulting others, answer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3864, an act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "be considered to have been erroneously collected" and insert "be subject to adjustment against subsequent contributions by him."

Page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "or a refund."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO VARIOUS COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Home Rule of the District of Columbia may sit during sessions of the House tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. During general debate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I so modify my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Also, that on Saturday morning a special committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. During general debate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate during sessions of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit tomorrow during sessions of the House.

0TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 975

# AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

JULY 17, 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

## CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3601]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 16, 35, 37, 45, 48, and 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert , *except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,125,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$145,00* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendme as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,143,40* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendme as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,000,00* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendme as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$503,00* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendme as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended follows:

Page 18, line 18, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the wor "hereof," insert the following: *until June 30, 1949*,.

Page 19, line 14, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the wor "transfer" and the period, insert the following: *The Secretary sha report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricu tural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Terr tory of the operation of the experiment station under the land grant colleg Acts.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$315,000* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,466,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$745,350*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,972,100*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert , *to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition*: and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$16,300,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert : *Provided further, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances: Provided further, That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$856,750* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,048,000* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$21,000,000* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$44,000,000* and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43, 50, 54, 57, and 59.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

### PENALTY MAIL

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: Reported in disagreement.

### RESEARCH AND MARKETING (HOPE-FLANNAGAN)

Amendment No. 2, payments to States, etc., for agricultural experiment stations: House appropriated $3,000,000; Senate, $2,500,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 3, Alaska allotment under amendment No. 2: Strikes out the House language transferring such allotment to the appropriation, "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska." Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4, for research on utilization and associated problems pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act: House appropriated $2,500,000; Senate, $3,000,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 5, for distribution and marketing studies: The House appropriated $2,000,000; the Senate, $2,500,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 6 relates to a total. Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Restores the House provision stricken out by the Senate:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof.

and adds the following:

> except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates.

### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 8, for salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $2,025,000; the Senate, $2,225,000; the conferees have agreed to $2,125,000.

Amendment No. 9, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,597,000; the Senate, $1,500,000; the House recedes.

### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 10: The House provided for the transfer to th appropriation for printing and binding from funds appropriated-

for administering the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 U. S. C. 608c–608d), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding i connection therewith.

The Senate struck out the House provision and inserted:

to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing an binding in connection with the activities under section 32.

Amendment No. 11: The House authorized transfers of $95,30 from certain general appropriations to the appropriation for printin and binding. The Senate authorized $170,000. The conferees hav agreed upon $145,000.

### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 12: Relates to limitation on expenditures fo personal services in the District of Columbia. Adjusted to conforn to action on amendment No. 13.

Amendment No. 13, economic investigations: The House appro priated $1,743,600; the Senate, $2,243,600; the conferees have agree upon $2,000,000.

### OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Amendment No. 14, salaries and expenses: The House appropriate $428,000; the Senate, $578,000; the conferees have agreed upo $503,000.

### RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA AND OFFICE OI EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: The House provided for an appro priation of $144,940 together with all Territorial funds available fo the Territorial Agricultural Experiment Station for a research pro gram under the exclusive supervision and control of the Secretary o Agriculture, requiring the University of Alaska to make available t the Secretary all of the lands, buildings, and equipment heretofor used by the university in connection with the experiment station The House omitted from the appropriation for payments to the State and Territories in connection with the several land-grant college acts the amount set up in the budget for Alaska, namely, $44,940, and included that sum in the total of $144,940 appropriated by the House for "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska." By amendment No. 15 the Senate struck out all of the House language and by amendment No. 16 inserted new language restoring the Alaska allotment o $44,940 to the appropriation for payments to States and Territories, and providing an appropriation of $100,000 for "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska" under the Secretary of Agriculture. The combined effect of Senate amendments Nos. 15 and 16 restored to the University of Alaska possession and control of the lands, buildings, and equipment belonging to the experiment station and all funds o

said station, while authorizing the Department of Agriculture to use its appropriation of $100,000 for the acquisition of land and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities.

The Senate recedes from its amendment No. 16 and agrees to the House provision, stricken out by Senate amendment No. 15, with an amendment providing that the same shall be effective until June 30, 1949, and that the Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land-grant college acts.

The conferees of both Houses wish to emphasize that the provision agreed to does not reflect any intention to depart from or modify the long-established policy of providing for research through grants to the States and Territories under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and Bankhead-Jones Acts, or to initiate a policy of taking over the State experiment stations. The provision agreed to relating to Alaska is to be regarded as of a temporary nature, pending the correction of a serious administrative deficiency in the past conduct of the research at this station. It is the purpose of the conferees that control and operation of the station by the university shall be restored as soon as conditions warrant.

Research in Alaska by the Department of Agriculture, independent of or in cooperation with the university experiment station, as may be provided, will continue, of course, beyond June 30, 1949, to the extent Congress may deem it wise to make appropriations therefor.

### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 17: Relates to a limitation on the amount which may be spent for personal services in the District of Columbia, which will be adjusted to conform to action taken on the amendments relating to the several work programs.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, relating to meat inspection: This item is in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20, Virus Serum Toxin Act: The House appropriated $290,000; the Senate, $340,000; the conferees have agreed upon $315,000.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 21, salaries and expenses: This amendment relates to the amount which may be spent for personal services in the District of Columbia. The House provided $500,000; the Senate, $540,912; the House recedes.

### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 22, forest diseases: The House appropriated $359,280; the Senate $379,280; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 23, soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: The House appropriated $1,391,000; the Senate $1,491,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,466,000. The increase of $75,000 over the amount appropriated by the House is for the purpose of keeping open the six stations which would otherwise be closed under the House amount.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 24, relating to expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $692,000; the Senate $758,688; the conferees have agreed upon $745,350.

Amendment No. 25, insect and plant disease control: The House provided $51,800 for Dutch elm disease; the Senate provided $151,800; the conferees have agreed upon $101,800. The House provided $499,000 for pink boll worm control; the Senate provided $749,000; the conferees have agreed upon $724,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $1,045,000; the Senate $800,000; the House recedes.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 28, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,055,378; the Senate $1,083,378; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 29, national forest protection and management: The House appropriated $23,764,891; the Senate $24,014,891; the House recedes. In approving the full amount of the Senate increase the conferees of both Houses have agreed that the earmarking of $25,000 for Lake Tahoe recreation area contained in the Senate Report No. 474 is not ratified by this report. It is believed however that this expenditure may be made by the Forest Service in the discretion of that agency out of any funds available for an expenditure of this character in the event it elects so to do.

Amendment No. 30, forest products: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate $1,250,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 31, forest resources investigations: The House appropriated $572,000; the Senate $822,000; the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33, acquisition of lands for national forests: The House appropriated $500,000; the Senate $750,000; the House recedes with the provision that the money is—

to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisitions.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Amendment No. 34, forest development roads and trails: The House appropriated $10,000,000; the Senate $11,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 35, forest highways: The House appropriated $5,300,000; the Senate, $8,300,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 36, relating to a total, has been appropriately adjusted.

Amendment No. 37, relating to expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $100,000; the Senate, $109,530; the Senate recedes.

FLOOD CONTROL

Amendment No. 38, flood control: The House appropriated $500,000; the Senate $1,500,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,000,000.

Amendment No. 39: Restores the House provision stricken out by the Senate:

That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances—

and retains the provision inserted by the Senate, amended to read—

That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 40, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $838,500; the Senate, $875,000; the conferees have agreed upon $856,750.

Amendment No. 41, soil conservation research: The House appropriated $673,000; the Senate $1,423,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,048,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 42: In disagreement.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Amendment No. 43, for the National School Lunch Act: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

Amendment No. 44, relating to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act: The House appropriated $525,300; the Senate struck out the item; the House recedes. Expenses necessary for the administration of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act during the fiscal year 1948 will be available within the administrative expenses limitation under the Section 32 appropriation entitled "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities."

MARKETING SERVICES

Amendment No. 45, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $2,211,000; the Senate, $2,286,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the "Market news service" appropriation: The Senate inserted the words "including broilers" in the language text referring to market news on poultry products. This insertion is merely interpretive language with reference to poultry products. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 47, market news service: The House appropriated $1,527,500; the Senate, $1,566,250; The House recedes.

Amendment No. 48, marketing farm products: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,100,000; the Senate recedes.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 49, relating to the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $141,000; the Senate $153,000; the House recedes.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 50, loans under title I and section 43, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 51, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $18,000,000; the Senate, $24,000,000; the conferees have agreed to $21,000,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 52, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $4,000,000; the Senate, $5,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 53, loan funds: The House authorized $225,000,000 to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose; the Senate, $250,000,000; the Senate recedes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 54, relating to the waiving of limitations on personal service expenditures to permit lump-sum terminal-leave payments: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 55, changing a section number: The House recedes.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 56, operating expenses, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $5,000,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the scope of the crop-insurance program: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Amendment No. 58, section 32 funds: The House provided that not more than $40,000,000 of such funds shall be available during the fiscal year 1948 for effectuating the purposes of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended; the Senate, $48,000,000; the conferees have agreed to $44,000,000.

Amendment No. 59, providing for the school-lunch program to be financed during the fiscal year 1948 with section 32 funds: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: The House appropriated $3,186,000; the Senate $3,486,000. Action on this amendment will depend upon action taken on the several amendments in disagreement requiring allotments for penalty mail.

Amendment No. 17: A District of Columbia salary limitation.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, meat inspection: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for the initial contribution to the "meat-inspection fund." The House provided that hereafter all expenses of the meat-inspection service shall be paid from the "meat-inspection fund" and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter assess and collect fees from the meat packers based upon the cost of the inspection, such fees to be paid into the "meat-inspection fund." The Senate has stricken out the House provision relating to the "meat-inspection fund" and the assessing of the packers for the cost of meat inspection and has provided the budget estimate of $11,140,000 for meat-inspection service. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 42, soil conservation payments: The House appropriated $165,614,290 for the 1947 crop year program and included a provision that no soil conservation payments program may be planned for the crop year 1948. The Senate struck out the House provision and provided a total of $295,635,044 for the 1947 crop program and authorized a program for the crop year 1948 in the total sum of $150,000,000. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 59, National School Lunch Act: The House appropriated $45,000,000 and provided—

> That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

The Senate struck out the House provision by amendment No. 43 and inserted new language by amendment No. 59 providing for the expenditure of $75,000,000 for the program from section 32 funds, with no limitation prohibiting the use of funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 50, farm-tenant loans: The House made no provision; the Senate appropriated $20,000,000. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 54, section 8: The Senate inserted language providing that—

> limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment inserting new language at the end of the Senate amendment, as follows:

> *Provided*, That in expending the appropriation herein for "Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry," service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947.

Amendment No. 57, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: The Senate inserted the following:

: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation.

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur. The proviso inserted by the Senate is considered by the managers to be purely a limitation on the 1948 program and is not intended to be prejudicial to future legislation.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

O

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 21, 1947
For actions of July 18 & 19, 1947
80th-1st, Nos. 138 & 139

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....44,52
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations....2,9,13,29 42,43,45
Audits.....28
Budgeting.....32
Claims.....29
Corporations.....28
Crop insurance.....4
Education.....62
Farm program.....37,54
Flood control.....61,65
Food, production.....6
Foreign affairs.....8,20,48 58,62
Forests and forestry.....56
Health.....51,63
Housing.....7
Information.....15,62
Labor, farm.....37,40
Lands, farm.....53
Legislative program...30,44
Livestock and meat.....39
Loans, farm.....22
Marketing.....45
Nomination.....47
Organization, executive...12
Personnel....16,22,31,33,38 46,55,60
Plant leases.....49
Poultry.....17
Presidential succession.52a
Prices.....18,35,48
Prices, support.....3
Property, surplus....34,53
Purchasing.....14
Quarantine, plant.....10
R.F.C.....9,19
Records, disposition of..24
Regional authority...26,66
Research.....39,41
School-lunch program....57
Soil conservation....36,59
Sugar.....27
Taxation.....5
Trade, foreign.....64
Transportation.....25,50
Veterans.....21,23,34,46
War powers.....11
Weed killers.....41
Wildlife.....56
Wool.....3,64

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on agricultural appropriation bill; acted on amendments. House passed supplemental appropriation bill. House Rules Committee cleared crop-insurance and wool bills. Senate agreed to House amendments to measure terminating numerous war and emergency powers. Senate committee reported poultry-improvement bill. Sen. Aiken announced plans to study CCC audit. House Committee reported bill for disposition of farm-labor camps and resolution to prevent crop damage from weed killer. House received conference report on Interior appropriation bill. Senate received appropriation estimate for Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. Sen. Wherry and Rep. Halleck said it is intended to adjourn Sat., July 26.

HOUSE - July 18

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3601, after rejecting, 196-206, a motion by Rep. Rankin, Miss., to recommit the bill to conference with instructions that the House conferees agree to the Senate amendment increasing REA loans from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000 (pp. 9461-7). Agreed to Senate amendments which had been reported in disagreement, as follows:

Agricultural conservation program. Agreed, 204-187, to a motion by Rep. Cannon, Mo., to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment increasing this item (pp. 9474-84). Concurred, 218-171, in the Senate amendment with an amendment by Rep. Case, S. Dak., to increase the item to $228,000,000, to increase the administrative-expense limitation to $22,000,000, and to strike out the provision regarding formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (pp. 9484-7).

Providing that limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments, with an amendment providing that, in spending the appropriation for "inspection and quarantine", BAI, service be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947 (p. 9496).

Limiting the scope of the crop-insurance program (p. 9496),

Insisted on disagreement to the following Senate amendments:

Meat-inspection increase and elimination of reimbursement requirement; after rejecting, 55-98, a motion by Rep. Andersen, Minn., to recede and concur (pp. 9471-4).

School-lunch increase; after rejecting, 181-195, a motion by Rep. Cannon, Mo., to recede and concur (pp. 9489-93).

Farm-tenant loans item; after rejecting, 172-193, a motion by Rep. Cannon to recede and concur (pp. 9493-6).

Penalty-mail increase (p. 9496).

Increase in D. C. salary limitation for BAI (p. 9496).

2. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Passed without amendment this bill, H. 4269 (pp. 9498-503), which had been reported earlier in the day by the Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. 990)(p. 9460).

The bill includes items of interest to this Department as follows:

(1) Amends the appropriation language contained in the 1948 agricultural appropriation bill for "eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious diseases of animals" to permit the Secretary to transfer to that appropriation from funds available to corporations and agencies of the Department such amounts as are necessary for eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Cong. The Committee report states that appropriations subsequently will be made to replenish the accounts from which transfers are made.

(2) $710,000 for the Sugar Rationing Administration for industrial rationing of sugar, terminal leave, and liquidation of the program (Budget estimate, $1,980,000, of which $750,000 was appropriated in the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948).

(3) Makes available from unobligated balances $1,000,000 for expenses of liquidating UNRRA (Budget estimate, $2,370,000, including $1,125,000 for this Department).

(4) $140,000 for liquidation of Office of Defense Transportation.

(5) $90,000 for liquidation of Office of Scientific Research and Development.

(6) $400,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

(7) $500,000 for liquidation of lend-lease program.

(8) $332,000,000 for relief assistance to war-devastated countries.

(9) $35,348,000 for care and handling of surplus property overseas.

(10) $100,000 for Food and Drug Administration's work regarding penicillin and production of candies containing coal-tar colors because of recent modification in sugar rationing.

(11) $4,000,000 for Office of Selective Service Records.

(12) $950,000 for materials distribution and liquidation of Office of Temporary Controls.

(13) $71,024,900 for International Refugee Organization.

(14) $100,000,000 for purchase of strategic and critical materials by Bureau of Federal Supply.

(15) Increase in administrative-expense limitation for Spruce Production Corp.

(16) $550,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas.

(17) Various judgments and claims items.

Following are excerpts from the committee report:

Payroll charges. "The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 permits charging the earnings of a pay period falling in two fiscal years to the appropriation current at the end of the pay period although there is no bar in the act to following the normal procedure of splitting the charge between the two fiscal years involved in which event the exact pay for the days in each fiscal year would be charged to that year's accounts. The committee wishes to put all

4268) making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, Report No. 99, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to call up the Government corporations supplemental appropriation bill, 1948, at any time and that all points of order be waived.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances we have no objection to waiving points of order on this bill in order to expedite consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a resolution from the American Legion.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have permission to sit during the rest of the week while general debate is going on in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. Copies of the conference report on this bill are not available. It is true the conference report is in the RECORD. I have read it in the RECORD. But there are a good many Members here no doubt who are waiting to get copies of the conference report and who feel they should have a right to study it because certain items are in disagreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the conference report in its complete text appears on page 9369 of this morning's RECORD and it is, therefore, available to the Members, even though there might have been some delay over at the Government Printing Office. The chairman of the subcommittee has no control over the rush of business in the Government Printing Office, but the text appears in the RECORD of this morning on the page just mentioned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how can we read the RECORD with these sunrise sessions? We are called to attend committee meetings at 9:30 and then the House meets at 10 o'clock. We should know what is in the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to make one observation. The RECORD came out this morning before the conference report would have been available under any circumstances.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but we should be given more time. This is a very important piece of legislation. It affects the farmers of this country more than any other legislation that will be passed or has been passed by this Congress during the present session and I am going to insist that the Clerk read the full conference report. I think the Members ought to know what is in the conference report and they cannot know until the complete statement is read.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that as I understand the matter the items in disagreement in the conference report, about which there undoubtedly will be a difference of opinion here today, are the very matters that were debated at great length when this matter was first before the House. So, it would seem to me that everyone would know fundamentally what the issues are, and that the thing that is here involved today is simply a restatement or redetermination of the attitude of the House of Representatives with respect to the conference action.

Mr. RANKIN. I dare say that not a dozen men in the House know what the Senate did or what is in the conference report.

Mr. HALLECK. I took a look at the newspaper this morning, and there I saw that the item for benefit payments was in controversy; that the item for the school-lunch program was in controversy; that the item for meat inspection was in controversy. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi, who is eminently fair, remembers quite well that those specific items were debated at great length when this measure was before us. The membership, generally, was here during those debates, and in my opinion know full well what the issues are that are involved. Now, I hope that the gentleman will bear with us in our effort to expedite the determination of these very important matters. Of course, the matter of agricultural appropriations is important. It is important to all of us. However, I can see no reason why we cannot proceed expeditiously with the consideration and determination of the measure before us.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think it will take up very much time to read the conference report, and I insist on it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 17, 1947.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations is quite mindful of the importance of the matter that comes before you today and at the same time it hopes it can expedite action on the conference report because of the full calendar that is ahead.

I hope, therefore, that perhaps I might make clear in a very brief space of time the situation that is before us. As I shoulder this responsibility, I often think of a very interesting recital that Solomon put in the mouth of Agur, the son of Jakeh, when he said:

> There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four which I know not: the way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid.

I presume if I were revising Solomon and bringing him up to date, I would probably say there are five things I know not of, five things too much for me. I would recite all of those four that Solomon set forth in ancient times, and then I might add: "The way of another deliberative body in the legislative branch of the Government with an appropriation bill."

To refresh you on the totals of money involved and the general picture, let me just say this: Last fall when the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture determined their needs, the aggregate of that determination was $1,600,000,000. I give it to you in round figures. Those were the needs that they expressed in the form of money. They said they would require $1,600,000,000 to express the various activities in which they were interested. That figure went to the Department of Agriculture and then it went to the Bureau of the Budget. And when the President's instrumentality finally completed its refinement, it had reduced it by $400,000,000. So that the over-all gross figure which came to us when we began hearings on this bill was not $1,600,000,000, which the bureaus had requested, but $1,200,000,000.

Then, we began, as the saying goes, to impress our wisdom upon the bill and upon those needs. There were seven weeks of hearings which required nearly 3 months to prepare to bring that bill to the floor of the House. When we had

completed our labors we determined that they could get along with $340,000,000 less than the amount in the Budget estimate. It was reduced accordingly, and that action was approved by the House. So that when the bill went to the other Body it carried $340,000,000 less than the Budget estimates.

Then, another distinguished Body began to work its will upon these provisions. It, too, had rather extensive hearings. I recognize the difficulties that many Members of the other Body have in attending all of the committee meetings which they are called upon to attend. But when the other Body had finished its deliberations, it had restored $200,000,000.

That is the great history of it. I think about the vigor and enthusiasm with which we approached the responsibility of effectuating economy in Government in January. But it does not count unless that same thesis and that same conviction persist up to adjournment date. You will get no credit with the taxpayers for economy by letting the passage of time and the pressures of groups and organizations and individuals and people finally erase that conviction. There will be credit for economy. To me, it is a singular thing as I go back and refresh myself on the Constitution and the formulation of our scheme of government that this was supposed to be the somewhat wild and irresponsible branch of Government.

And so the framers of the Constitution said, "You get only 2 years in office, but you get the power of the purse, and then you must come back and give an accounting of your stewardship." Then, by way of compromise, they said, "We will create another body in the legislative branch. They are to be selected by the State legislatures and they are to have a 6-year term. It is fair to assume that there will probably be a greater innate conservative tendency to hold you down over on this side." But in 1913 the Constitution was amended and they were elected by direct vote, and it is interesting to go over the last few years of our history to determine, even as the country has determined, what is the sound and conservative body in the Government today. If the fiscal integrity of this Government is to be defended and kept intact, it will be done in the House of Representatives and in no other place in the Government. That is your responsibility.

So we were presented with an increase of $200,000,000 in the bill as it left the House. You know, a conference committee is a noble institution. Men in felicity sit about a table, and there is a great interplay of forces and there is a great show of patience. Sometimes a bit of provincialism creeps in, but in the main here are men from both bodies seated around the table, seeking to express earnestly and sincerely, as best they can, their interests and their views for their people. Very rightly so. Then, the bargaining begins. Bargaining is a very, very interesting thing. I can best illustrate it by giving you a few examples. For example, in connection with research and research and marketing, the House put in a figure of $9,000,000. The Senate put in $9,500,000, but redistributed the amounts. So they agreed to back down on the $500,000 if we agreed to let their distribution stand. So we made that agreement.

In the Solicitor's Office the House cut out $500,000, and the Senate restored $200,000. So we had a long, amiable visit over how many lawyers are required in the Department of Agriculture. Finally, we took this $200,000 restoration and we cut it in half. So they gained $100,000 and we gained $100,000.

There was a startling thing about this bill. There was one reduction in another body and I shall be just as circumspect as I know how in conforming to the rules. There was one reduction in another body. The increase was $200,000,000. The one reduction in the bill was $245,000. It was for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. It seemed rather strange that the one economy should have been expressed on the distaff side, against the gentler sex. Now, it may be that we have been weak in that respect and gave them the budget estimate, but that was the one note of economy in the bill.

We got along reasonably well. That is part of the noble business of bargaining across the table: You give a little, you take a little. Obviously, Members of another body have just as many prerogatives as have we, and the purpose of the conference committee, after all, is to explore and to seek common ground. We did not always do it but we did do it on most of the items involved herein.

There are four major items in disagreement and those will be discussed at greater length when we consider them one by one. The first relates to meat inspection.

You will remember that the House wrote in a provision putting meat inspection on a fee basis to be assessed against the packers. It would save $6,140,000 the first year; it would save $11,140,000 annually in succeeding years. There has been great pressure on that item, Mr. Speaker. I have received telephone calls and telegrams from all over the country and I have received personal visits from people who are interested in that industry, but I have not yet been able to find an argument that would persuade me that the action taken by the House was wrong. So I propose at the appropriate time that the House insist on its disagreement, and I assume that at the appropriate time a preferential motion will be offered that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. It is perfectly all right, I shall be no crusader. You know it gets to be a pretty difficult thing and it is a tremendous tax upon one's energy to be a crusader on all the important issues that come up. I shall be content to place before you the facts, then let you work your own will. After all, that is the democratic process. If you decide that your conference committee is wrong then you tell us, and under your mandate and under your instruction we shall go back and seek to carry out that instruction. It was not so long ago that I took a very splendid drubbing on this floor at the hands of my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. O'HARA], with reference to the District of Columbia revenue bill. When the House had expressed itself we went back to the conference committee. We said to the gentlemen from the other body: Here is the firm view of the House expressed on the record, and so we have no choice. Either you accept it or there will be no bill. And so that is what we propose to do now. The first item therefore on which you will have an opportunity to express yourself is whether or not we should relent from the thing that you approved before and concur in the Senate amendment or whether you will reaffirm your belief that the House in the first instance was right.

The second item in disagreement is the so-called agricultural adjustment and soil-conservation and domestic-allotment payments. You will recall that the budget estimate was $301,000,000 and that $34,000,000 plus was earmarked for administrative expenses at the National, State, and local levels. When we got through we had reduced the amount to about $165,000,000. We allowed $150,000,000 in the bill for soil-conservation payments, and we cut the administrative expenses from $34,000,000 to $15,000,000. The Senate has restored all of the soil-conservation payments, and they have increased the administrative expenses from $15,000,000 to $27,000,000 plus. In addition to that, we struck out of the bill any authority for a program in the crop year 1948 on the theory that we should not permit it when that whole matter is in flux at the present time, and those on the Committee on Agriculture are considering an entirely new program. Finally, the Senate wrote in one provision putting a $500 limit on payment to any one participant.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has just referred to what he calls soil-conservation payments. May I ask the gentleman if it is not more correct to refer to that $290,000,000 expenditure as triple A benefit payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; those are what we have always known as triple A soil-conservation payments as distinguished from soil-conservation service, which provides technical information to farmers and assistance in the work of soil conservation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is it not a fact that the House subcommittee has given the soil-conservation program a very liberal amount, practically all they asked for, and when the statement is made that this is a cut in the soil-conservation program, there is a confusion between the programs?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite right.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Should not the RECORD show that the triple-A payments are for soil-conservation practices and that there is a relation to soil conservation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is for terracing and putting lime on fields, planting maple trees, and doing a thousand and one other things that are all carefully set out in the regulations as so-called soil-conservation practices.

Mr. HALLECK. When this measure was before the House formerly I spoke about fertilizer and limestone. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is present, was questioning me as to the fertilizer end of it. I took the trouble this morning to call up the Production and Marketing Administration to find out what is being done in Indiana. The total payments for the State of Indiana are almost $8,000,000. Of materials, phosphate was applied to the value of $1,168,000, potash $360,000, and liming materials applied $4,481,000. That certainly has nothing to do with what many people believe is soil conservation, involving contour farming, terracing, building of water dams, and various other practices that are being engaged in now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue and summarize.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say that I stand on my original statement that superphosphates were not furnished to Mississippi and my information is, as the gentleman from Indiana states, Indiana and some other States were furnished these materials primarily for the improvement of pastures but not for the cultivation of crops.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The next item in disagreement is the school lunch program. The House provided a direct appropriation of $45,000,000. The Senate modified that by taking money out of section 32 funds which are used for certain purposes, and increased the amount to $75,000,000.

The other item of major import in the bill is farm tenant loans. Originally there was a request for $50,000,000 to make these farm tenant loans 100 percent loans for a period of 40 years. That was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $35,000,000. When it came to our attention that a conference was to be held on the 9th of June to go into what they called land fever and inflated prices we did not feel that we were warranted in somehow or other having young men assume farming at inflated prices and being placed in jeopardy later when farm prices fell off, thereby develop a headache when the adjustment came and collection problems for the Federal Government which made the loan. The Senate put back $20,000,000. So there is that divergence.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, there will be four major items in disagreement. The first one is meat inspection. Do you want to put it all back and put it on a direct appropriation basis to cost $11,000,000 plus every year, or shall we follow the House recommendation and put it on a fee basis, saving $6,000,000 plus the first year and $11,000,000 plus thereafter.

Secondly, do you want to approve the action taken by the Senate restoring mainly this whole triple-A program and wiping out the economies effected by the House, which total somewhere in the neighborhood of $130,000,000?

Third, do you want to modify the school-lunch program or return it to the $75,000,000 level or do you want to ride along with the earlier action taken by the House at $45,000,000?

Fourth, do you want to restore the $20,000,000 of farm-tenant purchase loans in the face of land fever and inflation, or would you prefer to abide by the decision of the House and keep that money out of the bill until we can see a little more clearly?

So, there is the whole story. There are the four amendments that you will be called upon to vote. I hope that it will not take an hour on each one. Probably we can dispose of each one in 30 minutes. It is purely a case of having all of the facts properly presented. So, that is the situation, and I hope we can dispose of this expeditiously, and I conclude with the observation I made before, that this committee is, first of all, a creature of the Committee on Appropriations; it is a creature of the Congress. Never have we pretended that we are bigger than the Congress. Whatever your wisdom in the main is, our responsibility is to bring the facts to you and then let you express your own judgment without too much crusading on our part.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think it would be a service to me and probably to other Members if the gentleman would review these four items with the figures, please.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is agreeable, I will refer to them very briefly.

On meat inspection, No. 1, the budget estimate was $11,000,000-plus. It is to be taken out of the Federal Treasury, the direct appropriations. The House action makes it a fee imposed upon the packers. It would cost $5,000,000 for the first year. Thereafter it becomes self-contained, and the annual economy is expected to be $11,000,000 a year thereafter and $6,000,000 the first year.

Second, the Agricultural Adjustment Act payment to farmers, the budget estimate was $301,000,000-plus. The House wrote that down to $165,000,000, with a saving of about $136,000,000. The Senate has virtually restored the entire amount, so the question is do we concur in the Senate amendment or do we stand by the House figure and contrive this very substantial economy that represents a saving of more than one-third of the whole bill.

The next item is the school-lunch program. The first request was for $100,000,000; some of them wanted $110,000,000. The budget finally set up $75,000,000 and the House reduced it to $45,000,000. The Senate put it all back, and provided that it be taken out of the so-called section 32 funds. So there is the amount involved and the question of making it a direct appropriation or a section 32 appropriation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think we ought to also realize that the House action amounts to an eventual commitment of nearly $200,000,000 each year, and that if we follow the Senate we will have almost $300,000,000 for school lunches each year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not going to speak on that item until we finally got to it, but I will say a man appeared before us who represented the American Federation of Labor who made the statement that the Secretary of Agriculture had said that this should cost $600,000,000 a year. I could not find out where he got his figure, but Dr. Ockey, who runs the school-lunch program in the Department of Agriculture, in response to a question by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], said that if all the eligible schools come in it will cost somewhere between $350,000,000 and $400,000,000 a year.

The final item is the farm tenant purchase loans. The request from the budget was $35,000,000. The House deleted it entirely. The Senate put back $20,000,000, so your choice is between nothing and $20,000,000, particularly in the light of the situation which we face today where land has gone up by more than 100 percent.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. What are the total increases represented by the Senate bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The total increase was a little over $200,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I realize this is no time to make a speech in the gentleman's time, but I have one county in my district where they carry on this engineering process of contouring the land, and all that. It is one of the most remarkable demonstrations I have ever seen in the way of creating productive land that was nonproductive before and increasing the income to the farmer. How much has that been cut?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Practically nothing.

Mr. REED of New York. I wanted to make that clear. That has not been cut, has it? I wanted that in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Should not the gentleman be told, however, that while the supervisory and technical services have not been cut, the contribution toward the payment for what is affected by the House action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, with this conference report we come to what appears to be the last paragraph of one of the most remarkable chapters in the economic history of the country. It is a chapter which, with its lights and shadows, with its impoverishment and rehabilitation of the American farmer, would be a thrilling romance were it not for the deep tragedy in which it originated and in which we may again become engulfed.

All of us here on the floor remember those fateful days when the farmer, destitute and hopeless, saw the price of his products go down to where it paid him a mere pittance, or nothing at all, for his labor extending from dawn to dusk, not only his own labor but the labor of his wife and children in the field; when he saw his farm sold under the hammer for a song; when he saw the majority of his banks, not the city banks, for not a single city bank failed, but the majority of the country banks went under carrying the life savings of the countryside with them. We recall vividly the days when farmers in desperation stopped trucks on the roadside and poured the milk into the gullies; when the farmers stood by with rope and noose as a warning to predatory speculators when the sheriff was selling their land, and when determined farmers marched into the courtroom and pulled from the bench the judge who was enforcing the order evicting them and their neighbors from the homes which their families had held for generations.

That was the situation when we initiated the program of rehabilitation which should be implemented and financed by the bill before us today. In those intervening years under this nurturing program we have seen the farmer fight his way up from destitution up to the greatest prosperity the farmer and America have ever known. For America has prospered with the farmer, and by the farmer, and through the farmer. Under the program, which brought about this remarkable change, the farmer has produced as never before. Under its protection and encouragement the farmer helped win the war. We could not have won without the magnificent production of the American farm, and we could not have produced upon the American farm the food which fed our armies and our allies and won the war, had not this program made it possible.

But, as incredible as it may seem, they now propose to wreck the program, to abandon all that has been gained and return to conditions which destroyed American agriculture a little more than a decade ago. That is the purport of this bill and that is what you are called to vote upon in the consideration of this conference report.

My good friend, the able and versatile gentleman from Illinois, quoted from Holy Writ. You know, in the language of the old adage, there is a certain majestic personage who is also addicted to the quoting of Scripture. But the gentleman from Illinois referred to the four imponderable mysteries for which Solomon found no explanation. Ah, my friends, there is no mystery whatever in the attitude and intention of the committee on this bill—or, for that matter, of the legislative program of the session.

This has been an epic session. Every great interest, every great business combination, desiring legislative advantage, has come here and laid hands on everything that they wanted. The amount of legislative swag that has been carried away from this House and from the Congress in this session is beyond anything recorded in any similar period in congresional annals. Everybody has been taken care of except the farmer, except the veteran, except the children of America, so drastically discriminated against in this bill.

The situation is very well expressed by Lowell Mellett, one of the premier commentators of our times, in his syndicated column carried in the local press this week. He enumerated various interests that have come to Congress for handouts and the gracious hospitality with which they have been received and served. Here is what he says in part:

> The real estate people, for example. Rent control has been pretty well abolished and all attempts at legislation to improve the general housing situation put on ice.
>
> The railroad people seem about to get what they want, which is legislation excusing them from the operations of the antitrust laws.
>
> The electric power people will be free from Federal control, to a large extent, if the Senate follows the lead of the House.
>
> The gas and oil people, ditto.
>
> And the people who hire other people, in any large numbers, will be free from the unions—if the Taft-Hartley bill works.

To them that hath shall be given. And those with the open sesame who wanted something at the expense of the people have been taken care of this session. Nothing has been refused. But not the farmer, fighting a losing battle to save his soil; not the GI who wants to buy a farm and establish a home for himself; not the child on its way to school without breakfast, needing a bottle of milk and bowl of soup. They are not taken care of. This bill passes them by on the other side.

Let me read the concluding paragraph:

> Then there are the people who would like to have their children decently educated and the people who would like to have access to better medical care. Congress has listened to them and given them sympathetic assurances. But Congress cannot do everything at once. First things come first. And Congress has made evident what it regards as first things:
>
> Real estate, railroads, power, gas, oil, sugar, big incomes.
>
> These, so far as Congress is concerned, appear to be the people.

Now, let us see what this bill really proposes.

Do you know that for the current year the Department of Agriculture is operating on $375,000,000 less than it operated on in 1940? With a dollar buying infinitely less than before the war, the Department is allowed less than we gave it before the war. We are at the lowest point since 1940. And now this bill proposes to make a further cut next year of one-third of what we have for the present year.

I cannot believe this House is willing to stand on a record like that. I believe they will also do something for the farmer, something for the little man at the bottom, who is the foundation of the great prosperity we are enjoying today.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. In just a moment.

My friend the gentleman from Illinois quoted from Holy Writ. There is another passage which should not be overlooked: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth the corn." The farmer who is producing food so lavishly, who is supplying us with the most sumptuous table ever set in the history of any people when in many lands there is nothing but a crust of bread and a pallet of straw, is entitled to a small share of it. That is the question in the bill before us today, my friends.

But it is not merely a question of justice to the farmer. It is a matter of national interest.

For a hundred years back whenever the farmer has lacked a fair wage and a fair price for his products, the prosperity of the Nation has declined. Whenever the farmer was receiving a fair price, a fair wage for his labor and a fair income upon his investment, the Nation has prospered. It is an immutable law, written in the annals of every people.

Mr. Speaker, let me appeal to the House today, not for the sake of the farmer alone, not merely for the sake of the GI boy who wants to establish a home under his own vine and fig tree, not for the welfare of the children, the greatest crop in America today, but for the future prosperity of the American people, in this critical time, that we accept the Senate amendments with these modest provisions for continuing a program that has brought us a happiness and a prosperity that is the wonder and admiration of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri yields back 1 minute.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we have had long and extended hearings, we have had long and extended conferences, in an effort to resolve the differences that we find among us on the agricultural appropriation bill. I would like to call the attention particularly of the Members on the left-hand side of the aisle here to a matter that I do not believe has been called to their attention clearly. It has been stated here that after long and tiresome hearings these economies were made in the Department of Agriculture. The distinguished chairman of this committee, and there is none more able in the House and there is not a smoother talker in the House either, back

in February, before we had the first meeting and the first line of testimony, called us together and announced then what cuts would be made in the Department of Agriculture bill. To his credit, while he made that determination prior to any hearings, he stuck to his guns except in a few cases where the members of his own party failed to go along with him. I do not think that is based on sound procedure, and I daresay that is not the way to attend to the business of this Nation.

Most of the argument that has been made by these distinguished gentlemen with regard to triple A payments, for instance, is worthy of consideration, insofar as fixing next year's program is concerned, but, Mr. Speaker, when we come here this year to fix the appropriation for the triple A payments for this year's program, for instance, I hope you will listen to me, we come here to consider whether we will live up to a contract that was made last year in which the parties of the other part, the farmers, have done their share; their considerations have been delivered under the contract, and surely the Government, our Government, should do as it promised.

Each year, if you follow me, the practice has been for the Committee on Appropriations to announce the program for the ensuing year. We followed that practice. The Department of Agriculture relied on that announcement. The announcements went out to the farmers. This is not a case of sending them a blue check, but it is a case of saying, "If you spend out of your own pocket $2, the Federal Government will spend $1" in an effort to redeem the soil, the greatest natural resource which we have. After we followed that practice for a number of years here, each time when we came here with an appropriation bill to pay the commitments of the Federal Government, we would have some argument and some difficulty in getting the Congress to live up to it. Thus it was that last year Judge Tarver, then chairman of this subcommittee, said, "Gentlemen, we are fixing in this bill for next year a $300,000,000 program of soil-conservation benefits, and we have had this difficulty in the past, and if you do not want the Federal Government to enter into that contract, now is the time to say so and vote against this motion which I am submitting to you." And, be it said for every Republican member of the subcommittee, not a one of them opened their mouths, but stood there when this Congress affixed its signature to a $300,000,000 program for this year, with the chairman of the committee saying, "If you are not for it, if you are not going to live up to that program, say so now." The gentlemen, every one of them, good men as they are, and as much as I think of them, stood there not uttering one sound.

But here the Department announced that program. The farmers set out to earn those benefits; they spent the money out of their own pockets. And I will say that so long as I am a Member here, and I believe these members on my committee, if they think about it, know that my word comes ahead of most anything with me, and next to living up to my own word, I will continue to believe in carrying out the full faith and credit of the United States of America. The Congress has spent money abroad. We have done many things, because we were committed to it, but here is a commitment to the farmers of the United States. And when you go to them you are not going to them on the basis that we ask you to contribute to an economy, but you on the Republican side are going to them and saying, "We forced you to contribute to it by refusing to carry out the commitments and promises that we made to you," and do not think you are not going through that, and when they write back to your districts to the farmers who earned these benefits saying that "Congress has changed its mind, even though they made a contract with you, and you did your part," we are taking it back. Of course, I know they have an argument on the other side that there is a little fine print on these contracts which says that these payments will be made if funds are available. Do you want to say that a man dealing with this Congress has to read the fine print because it will be raised on him after he has performed his contract? Are you going to say that? I say that this small fine print notice to him amounts to that if $600,000,000 of benefits were earned, they could look only to the $300,000,000. That is what it really means. No, gentlemen, in an effort to equalize the opportunities of the farmers of this Nation, we have provided for parity payments or loans, and we fixed that parity at 90 percent in most cases, and the other 10 percent was held out so that the farmers of this Nation would use this 10 percent to maintain the fertility of the soil and increase the fertility of the soil which means a lower price at which the people of the United States may buy groceries and farm products. I think it is right when we go in to a farmer and say, "We are going to guarantee to you certain incomes on the products you grow, on the basis of benefit payments, but to insure that in growing crops you will practice conservation and will so conduct your business that you will not deteriorate this great national resource of this country, we will make the other 10 percent contingent upon you carrying out good soil practices." That is fair. The farmer spends twice as much as the Government spends on such a program.

We find it throughout this conference report here today, economy. I think I have as good a record as any man in this House on economy. I worked on the Navy subcommittee for many years, and I believe my record there will show that I saved millions. I voted to end UNRRA and against most of the foreign loans. I voted against the British loan. But we find here today the folks that are violating this commitment to the American farmer, after he has spent his money, after he has earned his due, are the same men who voted to send money abroad, saying, "We are willing to break the word, we are willing to destroy the full faith and credit of the United States Government with its own people, even though we have voted for the British loan and voted to send money across on the other side." They have said they are not willing to spend here for a school-lunch program. They say that this school program may go to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars. However, I offered an amendment to this bill that these funds be limited to those schools whose school authorities certify that they are unable under their budget to provide a school-lunch program out of their local funds. The majority Members claim they want this school-lunch program for those who need it and cannot have it because of the financial condition of the schools. If so, why did they vote down my amendment? That is the situation here today.

There are folks here that want the Democrats to make a good fight and lose it, because they think there is a lot of politics in this; that if you folks on the Republican side fail to carry out this commitment it will hurt you next fall. Be that as it may, I am more interested in carrying out the word of the Federal Government, regardless of which party will take the kick-back on it, than I am in the politics of this situation. I hope you on the left side of this aisle will realize what you are doing when you vote on these matters that are in disagreement, and will help us to carry out the commitments of our Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly at this time in the debate to refer to what has already been said. At the proper time, on specific issues, I should like to comment upon the points in disagreement.

I should like certain of the gentlemen upon this floor, who have already spoken, to realize that some of us, who are very much in favor of these cuts, and whose farm supporters and farm friends are very much in favor of the cuts, represent agricultural areas. There is very little if anything else in my district but agriculture, yet I added to the preliminary report, as did the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a statement to the effect that the cuts had not been deep enough.

For the benefit of those who listened to the gentleman from Mississippi who preceded me, who says we are unable to fulfill our commitments, may I say that the actual commitments today are $36,000,000, and the House bill appropriated $165,000,000.

My point is that I do not want the House to be led astray by, shall I say, overenthusiastic or perhaps somewhat partisan statements, that one side of the House or one side of the Capitol favors the farmer and the other side of the House or the other side of the Capitol does not. I can assure you that the bill that comes before you today is a bill which will benefit agriculture. I hope the position of the House managers will be sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that the vote which will be taken first will be on the approval of the conference report. The amendments I have discussed today are in disagreement, and one by one they will be reported to the House for action. So what

we vote on here now is the matter agreed upon in conference between the House and the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this will not preclude me from offering a motion to recommit to restore the Senate provisions on rural electrification, will it?

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit is, of course, in order immediately after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought we first had to vote on the amendments in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. No; the motion to recommit is in order after the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the gentleman refers to is not in disagreement. The House and Senate agreed on that matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I know what it is, but I am going to offer a motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. RANKIN. I am, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to be heard on the motion if it is in order.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read the motion to recommit, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recommit the conference report to the committee on conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 53 to increase the appropriation for loans for rural electrification from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit would raise the amount provided for rural electrification from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000—the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

You remember that the Rural Electrification Administration asked for $300,000,000, but the Bureau of the Budget only recommended $250,000,000, and the House Committee on Appropriations reduced it to $225,000,000.

When this measure was before the House I offered an amendment to raise the amount to $300,000,000. The House voted down my amendment and sustained the committee's recommendation of $225,000,000, or $25,000,000 below the budget estimate.

When the bill reached the Senate the amount was increased to $250,000,000, but the conferees rejected that amendment and reduced the amount back to $225,000,000.

By this motion to recommit I am merely endeavoring to raise the amount from $225,000,000 back to the $250,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the Senate.

This money will be loaned for the purpose of building rural power lines to the farm homes of the Nation, and every dollar of it will be returned with interest. It will add untold hundreds of millions to the wealth of this Nation, to say nothing of what it will do toward brightening the farm homes and relieving the drudgery of the men and women living in the rural districts in every section of the country.

The farmers are begging for these funds and the REA is anxious to see them get it.

While we are being asked to send money by the billions to Europe to rehabilitate countries that already have 90 percent of their farms electrified, while this country has less than 60 percent of her farms electrified, it seems to me that we can afford to provide these funds for our own people, especially when we know that every dollar of it will be returned with interest, and that, as I said, it will add untold hundreds of millions of dollars to the wealth of the Nation.

There are some Western States that have less than 15 percent of their farms electrified. They need these funds now.

Let us provide it and electrify every farm home in America as quickly as possible, and make this the richest and most desirable country on earth in which to live.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN), there were—ayes 86, noes 167.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 206, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—196

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Almond
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Boykin
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Forand
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hagen
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilday
King
Klein
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
Lemke
Lesinski
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Peden
Peterson
Pfeifer
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rabin
Rains
Rankin
Rayburn
Rayfiel
Redden
Richards
Rizley
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stratton
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Trimble
Walter
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—206

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Dague
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dondero
Eaton
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Hedrick
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Mason
Mathews
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Owens
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Snyder
Springer
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

NOT VOTING—28

Bell
Bland
Chapman
Clements
Courtney
Dingell
Folger
Fuller
Gifford
Gwynne, Iowa
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hays
Hébert
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Tex.
Kee
Kelley
Kerr
Kirwan
Ludlow
Patman
Powell
Riley
Rivers
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Vinson

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Vinson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD just previous to the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 407)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3950, entitled "An act to reduce individual income tax payments."

The provisions of this bill are identical with those of H. R. 1 except that this bill would not become effective until January 1, 1948, whereas H. R. 1 would have become effective on July 1, 1947.

I returned H. R. 1 to the House of Representatives on June 16, 1947, without my approval, stating that it represented the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time.

This is still the wrong kind of tax reduction and this is still the wrong time to provide for tax reduction.

The present bill is not consistent with sound fiscal policy. As I have stated to the Congress on previous occasions, while business, employment, and national income continue high, we should maintain tax revenues at levels that will meet current expenditures and also leave a surplus for retirement of the public debt. No other course is consistent with realistic and conservative management of the fiscal affairs of the Government.

Since H. R. 1 was disapproved, there has been no lessoning of the need to make substantial payments on the public debt. Maintaining the integrity of this debt is one of the primary obligations of the Government. I repeat that, if we do not reduce the public debt by substantial amounts during a prosperous period such as the present, there is little prospect of material reduction at any time.

I also pointed out in my message on H. R. 1 that necessary Government expenditures are still high. We are meeting tremendous obligations growing out of the war. The national-defense establishment still requires large sums. Our responsibilities for international rehabilitation have an important bearing on our efforts to secure lasting peace. The recent refusal of certain nations to join in common endeavors to establish conditions of world stability increases the difficulty of our task and exposes us to greater risk. Until we are better able to estimate the cost of our investment in world peace and collective security, it is unwise to make so large a cut in our Government's future income that our ability to meet our needs would be impaired.

As far as can be determined at present, it is not likely that expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 will be substantially less than I estimated in the January budget message. A careful appraisal of the outlook for both receipts and expenditures indicates that it is not possible, under present conditions to make a major tax reduction and an adequate payment on the public debt at the same time.

Not only does this bill represent an unsound fiscal policy, but it would also contribute to inflationary pressures which we have made progress in combating but have by no means overcome. As I stated in the message on H. R. 1, there is no justification for tax reduction so long as price stability at sound levels has not been secured and business, employment, and national income continue at peak levels.

Since the veto of H. R. 1, income payments to individuals have continued to rise, and the general level of business activity is establishing new high records. The total number of civilians gainfully employed has also continued to rise. Total employment in June increased by 1,725,000 over May, and the total number now employed is over 60,000,000—the highest in our history. There is still no convincing evidence that a recession is imminent.

Tax reduction now would delay the readjustments of prices and wages necessary to maintain this high prosperity It would lead to an even higher level of prices for consumer goods. It would increase the danger of a recession.

For all these reasons, which are more compelling now than they were 1 month ago, I regard the present bill as unsound and unsafe.

I also regard it as unfair.

In my message of disapproval of June 16, I pointed out that H. R. 1 was inequitable in that it would reduce taxes in the high-income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared with the reduction in the low-income brackets. I stated that a good tax-reduction bill should give a greater proportion of relief to low-income groups.

Since the present bill is identical except as to its effective date, it is, of course, subject to the same criticism.

It is important to remember that, during the war, Federal income taxes were extended to millions of low-income families who had never before paid them, and taxes on moderate incomes were increased by a far greater proportion than those on higher incomes. The amount by which present income taxes exceed those payable under the Revenue Act of 1940 represents a special wartime tax burden.

When the time comes to lessen this wartime tax burden, it is only fair that we should follow a pattern which is the reverse of that under which the burden was imposed. That is to say, this wartime tax burden should be reduced on a basis that is fair to low-income groups as well as to high-income groups.

The failure of H. R. 3950 to follow this equitable principle is strikingly demonstrated by the following examples:

The bill would remove 21 percent of this wartime tax burden for a married couple with an income of $2,500.

The bill would remove 64 percent of this wartime tax burden for a couple with an income of $100,000.

The bill would remove 85 percent of this wartime tax burden for a couple with an income of $1,000,000.

I am unequivocally committed to the right kind of tax reduction at the right time. The right kind of tax reduction must be based upon a careful consideration of all elements of our tax structure.

A premature and faulty tax reduction bill such as H. R. 3950 would inject into our tax system inequities which would greatly increase the difficulty of making desirable revisions.

A fair and proper revision of our tax structure should result in an equitable distribution of tax reductions. It should be designed, also, to assure a balanced budget, adequate debt retirement, and an adequate reserve for meeting our international commitments and carrying out our foreign policy. It should be designed to provide stability rather than instability in our economy, and should be properly timed for that purpose.

Because H. R. 3950 is at complete variance with the fundamental requirements of a good tax bill, I am compelled to return it without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the bill and message will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the House membership has discussed the bill H. R. 1 and the bill H. R. 3950 fully. I am satisfied every Member in the chamber has made up his mind how he is going to vote. There is therefore no occasion, as I see it, for further debate.

I do wish to say, however, that we have made an honest attempt to secure tax reduction for 49,000,000 tax-harassed Americans. It is highly improbable that we shall make another effort, but rather we will submit the matter to that great tribunal, the American people, in 1948, and let them decide whether or not they want tax reduction. It is clear to me that the President will not approve any tax reduction bill that is not basically political.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 108, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—299

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Fletcher
Fogarty
Foote
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Hartley
Hedrick
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kefauver
Keogh
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Morrison
Morton
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Toole
Owens
Passman
Patterson
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Ramey
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
West
Wheeler
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—108

Abernethy
Albert
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Douglas
Drewry
Eberharter
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Flannagan
Folger
Forand
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hardy
Havenner
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hobbs
Holifield
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.
Kennedy
King
Klein
Lanham
Lesinski
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
Madden
Mahon
Marcantonio
Mansfield
Miller, Calif.
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Murdock
Norton
O'Brien
Pace
Peden
Pfeifer
Pickett
Poage
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rabin
Rains
Rayburn
Rayfiel
Richards
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stigler
Teague
Thomason
Trimble
Walter
Whitten
Williams
Winstead
Worley
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—23

Bell
Bland
Chapman
Clements
Courtney
Fuller
Gifford
Gwynne, Iowa
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hays
Hébert
Johnson, Tex.
Kee
Kelley
Kirwan
Ludlow
Patman
Powell
Riley
Rivers
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Vinson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson and Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa and Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mr. Bland and Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Fuller and Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. JONKMAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, on today the House received the message of the President vetoing H. R. 3950, an act to reduce individual income-tax payments, and the House has concluded a vote on the veto and passed the bill over the President's veto by a vote of 299 to 108, nearly 3 to 1 and 83 votes more than the required two-thirds majority. The action of the House must have brought joy to nearly 50,000,000 income taxpayers, but their joy was of short duration as the matter was brought up in the Senate and the Senate voted 57 to 36 to override the Presidential veto. It did not receive a two-thirds majority as required by law and therefore the nearly 50,000,000 income taxpayers have again been denied relief from their heavy war tax burdens.

The House and Senate passed, by very substantial majorities, the tax reduction bill, H. R. 1, sometime ago. It went to the White House and was vetoed by the President. The House failed to override the President's veto. If two persons had changed their votes from "No" to "Yes" the veto would have been overridden on the first tax bill by a vote of 270 to 135. The vote, however, on the veto was actually 268 to 137. As the House did not override the veto it did not go to the Senate for action.

The vote today showed considerable change of sentiment in the House on this question. The vote in the House was 299 to 108—83 votes more than the necessary two-thirds majority—but because of the veto and the failure of the Senate to override it, there is no relief in sight for the American people. The bill vetoed today and passed by the House is identical with the tax reduction bill passed by the House and Senate and vetoed by the President on June 17, 1947 with one exception. The reduction in H. R. 1 was to take effect July 1, 1947. Under the bill vetoed today, the reduction would take effect January 1, 1948.

THIRTY MILLION IN LOW BRACKETS BENEFITED

Approximately 30,000,000 income taxpayers in the low-income brackets under this bill were given a 30-percent reduction or almost one-third of their taxes. This would have benefiteed tens of millions of workers in factories, shops, mills, mines, on the farms and railroads, teachers, restaurant and hotel workers and millions of farmers. This bill would also give to approximately 1,500,000 income taxpayers who are 65 years of age or over an additional exemption of $500. It would give to 15,000,000 to 18,000,000 income taxpayers in the middle income bracket 20 percent reduction, or a cut of one-fifth of their taxes and it would give 10½ percent reduction to less than 1,000 income taxpayers in the highest brackets. Under the present law the income taxpayers in this highest bracket are required to pay 87 percent of their taxable income. In other words they pay in taxes 87 cents out of every dollar of their taxable income. I think most reasonable people agree that is taking a big bite out of the income of these less than 1,000 people and under this bill they would get a reduction of only 10½ per cent and they still would be taxed 76½

percent, but these 30,000,000 income taxpayers in the lower brackets would have had their taxes cut 30 percent or nearly one-third.

All of these taxes are what we call emergency war taxes. The war closed in Europe more than 2 years and 3 months ago and the war in the Pacific closed nearly 2 years ago. Undoubtedly it is high time we are giving to the American people some tax relief from these war taxes. Many of the countries we have been helping in a large way have given their people tax reductions.

The President in his brief message, as he did in June when he vetoed the tax reduction bill, H. R. 1, said that this is still the wrong time and wrong kind of tax reduction. He also states that we do not know yet what heavy obligations we may assume in rehabilitating other countries and in providing relief for the people of other countries. He states in part as follows:

> As far as can be determined at present, it is not likely that expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 (which began July 1, 1947, and will end June 30, 1948) will be substantially less than I estimated in the January budget message * * * a careful appraisal of the outlook for both the receipts and expenditures indicates that it is not possible under present conditions to make a major tax reduction and an adequate payment on the public debt at the same time.

Mr. Truman and his party apparently are committed to the policy that they have followed ever since they took over the control of the Government. It is a policy of tax and spend. They know how to increase taxes and increase the debts of this country but they have never learned the technique of reducing expenditures and reducing taxes. This really is the history of the Democratic Party ever since before the Civil War and Mr. Truman and his administration refuse to turn away from that policy and it now appears that if the American people are to have relief from this tax and spend policy, they may have to resort to the ballot box in 1948 and elect a Republican President. The Republican Congress will submit another bill in January 1948.

The Democrats have increased taxes and made debts through the years and it has always been necessary for the Republican Party to come along and reduce expenditures, taxes and pay the debts of the Nation. In this respect, it is just as necessary for a Republican administration to follow a Democratic administration as it is for an ambulance to follow after the battle to gather up the wounded and clear up the wreckage.

The President called upon the new Republican Congress to appropriate and turn over to him $37,500,000,000 to spend for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. He estimated that the revenues would amount to a little over $38,000,000,000 and there would be a surplus, according to his estimate, of less than $500,000,000. The Republican Congress has cut out billions of dollars that the Democrats intended to spend for the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, by cutting out hundreds of thousands of useless officeholders and unnecessary and wasteful expenditures of the taxpayers' money and this Congress has also reduced the budget of the President and without injuring the efficiency of the Government. We still have hundreds of thousands of unnecessary Federal officeholders, and there is still a great deal of waste and extravagance on the part of the Federal Government that can and must be eliminated.

Under the present high tax rates, the revenues for the present fiscal year have amounted to more than $42,000,000,000 and it is estimated that on June 30, 1948, we will have a surplus of more than $9,000,000,000. The tax reductions, as provided under this bill, would have been less than $4,000,000,000, and there would still remain a surplus in the Treasury of $5,000,000,000, and this means that there could be a very substantial sum paid on the national debt and still have a surplus in the Treasury, but Mr. Truman insists that next year he will ask for approximately the same amount as he set forth in his budget in the present session of the Eightieth Congress.

The late President Roosevelt was also known as a very liberal spender of public funds. As I understand, the greatest amount he ever asked for in a peacetime year was less than $12,500,000,000. Mr. Truman's budget for three times this sum was to be expended in the third peacetime year after the war. Now, he tells the Congress and the American people that he proposes to spend approximately that same sum in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, although the Congress has resolutely insisted that there must be a reduction in the overgrown and sprawling bureaucracy, which not only extends over this country but over the entire world.

I have helped to consider many tax bills involving income taxes through the years of my experience in Congress, and to my way of looking at it, this is the fairest to all groups of our income taxpayers that I have ever helped to pass in Congress.

While the American people have been very generous through the years in their sacrifice of blood and treasure to the other people of the world, tens of millions of these loyal and patriotic American citizens are beginning to wonder when the President and the Congress will grant to them some relief from these tremendous burdens of the war.

The President should have signed this bill. It came to him after thorough consideration and approval of an overwhelming majority of the representatives of the people in the Congress. The Constitution gives to the Congress the control of taxes. An overwhelming majority in both Houses has twice now carried out that mandate of the Constitution but through the veto, giving to the President in effect 72 votes in the House and 16 votes in the Senate, the will of the American people through their representatives has been thwarted. If this bill had been approved the $4,000,000,000 of tax reduction covered by this bill would have gone into the pockets of these 50,000,000 wage earners, farmers, and other American citizens to be used by themselves and their families instead of being swallowed up by this tremendous bureaucracy that has been built up here at Washington. This bill should have been approved today. Next year the Congress will take up this matter again and also give relief in the matter of excise taxes and other taxes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Post-Gazette of Pittsburgh, Pa., and from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the President has been charged with politics for his veto of the tax bill. What advantage the President or the Democratic Party might hope to obtain from a policy of opposition to tax reduction is not clear. Everybody, I think, without exception, both in and out of Congress, would like to be able to favor a tax-reduction bill at this time, but the President has indicated that he cannot jeopardize the domestic and international responsibilities of this Nation by a premature curtailment of Federal revenues. So, despite political appeal for tax reduction, the President again has wisely vetoed the tax bill.

The Republicans say that they will make political capital of his action. They say that they promised the people tax reduction in the 1946 election and that their mandate has been frustrated by the President. The people, however, have indicated that they do not want tax reduction at the expense of debt reduction, nor do they desire, by too hasty tax reduction, to preclude the United States from assuming its rightful role in the rehabilitation of the war-torn world as the bulwark of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 5, 1947, and another from the Christian Science Monitor of July 11, 1947.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of July 5, 1947]

DETERMINED, BUT BLIND

Like a blind mule with a hot foot, Congress is plunging importunately along toward repassage of the tax-reduction bill, the only change being to make the effective date next January 1 instead of July 1, 1947.

Congress seems determined to try to adjust the Nation's spending to a new tax rate rather than to adjust the tax rate to spending requirements as logic dictates.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 Congress was required by last February 15 to adopt a joint resolution putting a ceiling on Government expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Nearly 5 months after the deadline, Congress still hasn't agreed on how much can be cut from the President's $37,500,000,000 budget and has not adopted a budget resolution. Economy-minded Senator BYRD of Virginia has announced quite properly that he will not support a tax reduction until this is done. We hope that enough Senators to sustain another Presidential veto will take the same sound position.

There is another compelling reason for proceeding carefully in fiscal affairs.

On July 12 most of the nations of Europe are expected to gather in Paris to start work on a European recovery plan suggested by Secretary of State Marshall.

Britain and France, who have taken the initiative in European recovery, are in as much haste to survey Europe's needs as Congress is to cut taxes. They can be expected to present us with a plan late in the summer or early in the fall.

Unofficial estimates have been that we will be asked to provide assistance in the sum of $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 a year for the next 4 years.

When the recovery plan is presented, Congress will face a momentous decision. It can support Secretary Marshall's suggestion and help Europe get back on its feet in our own national self-interest or it can give world communism a wonderful opportunity to sneer and say, "I told you so."

We need have no doubt that Russian refusal to participate in European recovery is well calculated upon the possibility that we will renege on Secretary Marshall's proposal, thus discrediting this country in the eyes of the world.

To follow through on the Marshall proposal and thus frustrate Russian ambition to control Europe, Congress probably will be asked to spend considerably more than the four billion it expects to save in a tax reduction. Weighing the possibilities in grave decisions ahead, we might yet do well to keep the budget balanced at the present tax rate, with little or nothing left for debt retirement.

We favor a tax reduction in principle. We also support heartily any Government economy that serves the national interest. Unquestionably there is great popular support for strong arguments in favor of relief from burdensome taxes now that the war is over.

But we believe it is the better part of wisdom to proceed cautiously at this time, accumulating as much surplus as possible during a period of prosperity, determining more fully the demands upon our economy before reducing our ability to meet them.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of July 11, 1947]

TAXES—NEW CONTEXT

The politician's lexicon tells him that the way to the voter's heart is through the taxpayer's pocketbook. The lexicon speaks louder than the public-opinion polls. Otherwise Congress would be paying more attention to the latter. These have indicated a greater interest in national debt reduction that in tax cuts.

Ten to three, the Senate Finance Committee approved the Republicans' new tax reduction bill which the Senate takes up today. The difference between this measure and the bill which President Truman vetoed is a difference of date. Under the new measure the date on which tax reduction would become applicable would be January 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947. The difference in dollars is negligible. And the President has announced he will veto this bill, too.

To be sure, there are other considerations, like the effect of the timing on business. But this is problematical. Only if a slump of unforeseen proportions occurs in the next 6 months will the effect of tax cuts on business be important.

But the event is not forecast. On the contrary, new business financing promises to be greater in the third quarter of this year than in either the first or second quarters.

This disposes of yet another argument in favor of tax cuts, namely, that they would encourage a needed expansion in the supply of "risk capital." Bankers say this supply is sufficient for the needs of big business, shorter for smaller business. But tax cuts would provide no special inducements for capital in the small business field.

The most considerable aspect of the new date for tax cuts, therefore, seems to be that it would bring them 6 months nearer to election time.

Those favoring tax cuts include many voters who would like to see Washington spending habits revised. But tax cuts will not guarantee such a revision, especially if they take public attention off the national debt.

Regardless of economies in governmental operations, Americans are confronting a period in which the United States must find huge sums to carry forward the work of world reconstruction begun under the Marshall plan. This must not fail. The security of the United States is at stake.

Had it not been for world conditions which called forth the Truman Doctrine and the subsequent Marshall plan, the Republican preelection ideas on tax cuts might well have proved feasible. For there were signs that revenues would permit tax cuts along with a reduction of several billion in the debt. But now a new situation must be faced. It is one that calls for a most conservative approach.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the American people have not been told by the majority party that income-tax reduction is a part of their plan to shift the tax load from those most able to pay to the lowest income groups. It is now apparent that enactment of new excise or sales taxes will be offered as a part of the Republican tax program in 1948. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Sun of July 13, 1947.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of July 13, 1947]

SMILING ON A SALES TAX

As part of the general overhauling of the tax laws that is being planned for 1948, reports from Washington indicate that long-range Republican strategy contemplates the enactment of a Federal sales or excise tax. According to official transcript, HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, said, "It is the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income-tax group over to excises."

An excise tax is similar to a sales tax. Both are imposed upon things rather than upon persons, one being collected at the manufacturing level and the other at the retail level. The economic effect of such a tax is much the same as a rise in prices or a cut in wages. It bears little relation to the individual's income or ability to pay and would fall hardest on those having low incomes.

It is appalling to find leaders of the majority party in Congress suggesting, apparently in all seriousness, that a major share of the cost of government be shifted away from progressive taxes, which distribute the load in accordance with ability to pay, and toward regressive taxes which levy a burden on commerce and purchasing power.

Many expert studies of our tax system have suggested that long-term reform should work toward the abolition of those excise taxes now in effect as a means of increasing mass purchasing power, increasing the flow of goods and increasing the national income. Yet at a time when the central domestic problem of the American people is to achieve a permanently high level of production and employment, we find the majority party proposing a scheme of taxation in direct contradiction of that philosophy. We can't believe the people would ever accept it.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the possibility of political unpopularity from his veto of the tax reduction bill, the President had the courage to place the overall national welfare above partisan advantage. This veto is indeed the act of a statesman and a truly great President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Admiral F. E. M. Whiting.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO FILE AMENDED REPORT

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, because of an error in printing of the report by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on H. R. 3911 (Rept. No. 725), certain instructions to the printer have been incorporated as part of the report. As a result, some slight confusion has been caused to the many people interested in this legislation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to file an amended report correcting this single error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REFUND OF TAXES ILLEGALLY PAID BY INDIAN CITIZENS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WELCH, D'EWART, and FERNANDEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 1 and 17 may be passed over at this time. They are nothing more than difficulties that cannot be resolved until the other amendments have been disposed of, so that there will be no controversy about it.

I ask also that amendments numbered 18 and 19 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments numbered 18 and 19.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 26, line 7, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$11,140,000."

Amendment No. 19: Page 26, line 8, strike out in line 7 the words "for deposit in the Treasury," the balance of page 26 and all of page 27 down to and including line 23.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 18 and 19.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves that the House recede and concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 18 and 19.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. The Committee on Agriculture discussed this proposal very carefully and, as the gentleman from North Carolina has said, it unanimously approved retention of the original item in the bill as now proposed by the Senate amendment, so that the cost of inspection of meat shall be borne by the public rather than passing it on to the consumers or back to the producers.

I feel that the inspection of meat and the services incident thereto are a great deal similar to the services rendered by other agencies of the Government. All people enjoy the benefits of having good wholesome meat, good wholesome food in those lines where they are dealing with highly perishable products like meat.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the handling of a measure of this kind by the Committee on Appropriations. I have the highest regard for the distinguished members of that committee and their ability, but this is legislation on an appropriation bill. Before we attempt to change our basic law we should have it done by a legislative committee rather than to have an appropriation committee, without full and complete hearings on the subject, pass legislation changing the basic law, as is done in this instance.

As far as cost is concerned, of course, the large packers of the country will not absorb that cost. They will be able to pass the costs of the inspection service back upon either the producers or add it into the costs that they charge the consumers. But I am aware of the fact that there are a good many small processors throughout the country in every State who do some business in interstate commerce. It will be very difficult for these to pay out fees in competition with the larger operators, and therefore they will either do away with the inspection service or do business purely in the intrastate market. So it is my conclusion that the larger operators will get the full benefit, and increase their business, and a good many small processors will be put out of business.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is not this one problem involved? So much money is appropriated that is supposed to take care of the companies that are in existence at the present time, but if another company wanted to do interstate business and wanted an inspector, it is prevented from having one unless it comes to Congress and gets the amount of money available increased; is that not right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman. At least under the committee proposal he will have to pay for the cost of the inspector and, furthermore, I am inclined to believe that the inspector, knowing that fact, might be more or less under the domination of the man who hired him or who paid his wages, even though it was paid indirectly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The point I am trying to make is that we do not want to get a set-up whereby a few packers are going to have a monopoly on the meat that is going to be inspected. We should have some formula whereby, if additional packers want to ship interstate, they should have some means of having this inspection without having to come and get the appropriation increased.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the proposal of the Committee on Appropriations is a good deal like suggesting to a bank that it employ its own bank examiner and pay his own salary. It is the function of the bank examiner to protect the general public, the same as the meat inspector. I have a small packing plant in my district, and I think what the gentleman says is exactly correct. It operates against the small packer in favor of the big packer, because the big packer can pass the costs along, and the small packer would find this just one more hurdle in meeting competition.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct. I urge that the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], to concur in the Senate amendment, will be agreed to. Such action on the part of the committee will be in the interest of the health of all people and assure them of a meat supply that is free from disease.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will approve the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. We have had a splendid meat-inspection service in this country for many years, since 1906. It has been worth every cent that it has cost, and it has not cost very much, as far as that is concerned. It was instituted, in the first place, in the interest of the public health, and that is the justification for it, to protect the public from diseased and contaminated meat products.

At the time that the meat-inspection service was instituted back in 1906, there were extensive hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture, and at that time it was proposed that it be financed by the packers, but the committee in its wisdom, after considering the matter from all sides, decided that, being in the interest of the public and the public health, it should be maintained by the public, and that is the way it has been maintained during all these years.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations in the House without conducting any hearings, without giving the public or the packers or anyone else who was concerned an opportunity to be heard, adopted the amendment which was in the bill as it passed the House. The Senate subcommittee did hold extensive hearings on the matter. They went into it from the standpoint of the public, and the standpoint of public health, and after doing so they voted the House provision out of the bill and reinstated the inspection service in the same form we have had it during all these years. I believe that that would be the result in the case of any hearing which went into the merits of the proposition.

In addition to the merits, there is this question which I cannot help but feel has some bearing here, and that is that this is purely a legislative question, one that should be decided by the legislative Committee on Agriculture. If it is a question which demands consideration, I can assure the House that that committee will consider it. But let us not vote today for a legislative provision upsetting and overturning a fine Government service that has protected the health of the public for more than 40 years. I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit amazed sometimes at positions that are sometimes taken by men on the floor. The argument has been made in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota that the meat inspection service has performed well under the law in protecting the interests of the consuming public so that disease and unsanitary meat will not find its way onto the table of the American consumer. Agreed.

How do these inspectors work? They work pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed. If the law stays as the House committee asks that it be, the inspectors will be on the job as they are now. The law defining what is bad meat will be exactly as it is now. The penalties for interstate transportation of unsanitary or diseased meat will be exactly as they are now. The regulations are already set up to put this thing into force and to carry it out under the position taken by the House committee.

You would think this is something new, yet my good friend from Minnesota who sits on the appropriations subcommittee that handles the Pure Food and Drug Administration well knows that it has been the sense of that committee of which he is a member, and with which he has frequently concurred, that we should try in this Congress to see to it that these services are as far as possible paid for by the industry that is affected, and take them off the general taxes.

Let me call your attention to a few facts. We did that with respect to the fish and oysters and sea food this year.

What is the situation as to pure food and drugs, as to cosmetics, and that sort of thing? Can you think of anything that might be more injurious to the public health than the distribution of impure drugs and impure cosmetics?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Lipstick.

Mr. KEEFE. Lipstick, if you please, vitamin pills, and what have you, the new streptomycin drug, the various forms of drugs that are now being manufactured, penicillin, and so forth. Who pays the inspection fees there? They are paid by the industry itself. The next bill that will come up, the deficiency bill, contains a reimbursable item to set up an inspection service for this new drug, streptomycin. It permits the Pure Food and Drug Administration to get the inspection service at work. The entire cost will be reimbursed into the Treasury of the United States by the manufacturers of streptomycin. That is the program of the Pure Food and Drug Administration in all its activities wherever it is possible. The manufacturers of these products are made to bear the cost of inspection.

As far as meat inspection is concerned, suppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Minnesota is not carried. The inspection service will go on just exactly as it is now. These people would not dare put insanitary, unsafe, or rotten meat into interstate commerce. They would be doing it today if they were so disposed, because whether you have an inspection or do not have it, the law making it a penalty to put that into interstate commerce is still on the books. It is up to them in the protection of their own business, just as the manufacturers of streptomycin and penicillin and these other chemicals know it is in the interest of their own business to see to it that proper inspection is had. They are perfectly willing to pay for it. So, aside from the argument made by my good friend from Kansas that he feels it somewhat of an affront to think that the Committee on Appropriations would do, as he says, "invade the proper field of the Committee on Agriculture," it does not seem to me there is very much to the argument in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. I will tell you why. I have been in the Meat Inspection Service, and I know something about it. I want to explain to you the principle of this problem.

If a packer has Government inspection, that is one thing. But if a packer does not have Government inspection likely as not he does not do interstate work. This packer will have a local inspector instead of a Government inspector. Suppose we have an animal that has been slaughtered and he had three or four or five tubercular infections around the outside of the body, around the maxillary region and around the throat, and probably two or three or four foci in the lungs, and mysentery glands. Then they hang this carcass up and all the viscera have been removed. Who is going to be able to tell that that beef ever had tuberculosis? No inspector can detect this. That meat would pass for food probably with some type of inspectors. Now, where is this beef going? If this beef had been inspected by the Federal inspectors, you can be as sure as anything in the world that that carcass would go to the tank. But if the beef was inspected by a local inspector, I will leave it to your own judgment where this carcass is going.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the gentleman from Wisconsin when he refers to the manufacturers of streptomycin is referring to one or two great institutions, but that here we are dealing with approximately 10,000,000 producers of hogs, cattle, and sheep?

Mr. GILLIE. Why, the gentleman from Wisconsin is just as wrong as he can be. The Government inspectors who inspect this meat, of course, will be paid by the Government. In the majority of cases they will not be paid by the Federal Government if they are not doing interstate work. They are not going to be Government inspectors. They are going to be local inspectors. The proverb, "Whose bread I eat, whose song I sing," will apply here—that is what will take place just as sure as anything in the world.

Now, to my way of thinking, if we are going to keep our inspection service on the high plane that it has been for these past 40 years we must leave it under Federal control all the way through, not only by having it controlled by the Bureau of Animal Industry, but financed by the Bureau of Animal Industry. That is the only way we can have a first-class meat inspection service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We all recognize that the gentleman addressing us is one of the outstanding authorities on diseases of animals and what should be done in connection with supplying meat for the people. I know the gentleman is interested in the health and welfare of more than 140,000,000 Americans who eat meat every day.

Mr. GILLIE. Surely.

I ask that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the observation of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], to the effect that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] was as wrong as he could be. On that point I can express no opinion at the moment, but I can express the opinion that the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, has simply not so much as touched the issue that is involved here. So it becomes necessary to pick up all the fragmentary pieces and give you a perspective picture. So we always go back to the Bureau of the Budget.

Meat inspection has been handled by the Federal Government since 1906. A very distinguished gentleman graced this chamber back in those days, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. His son is a Member of this House today, and a very distinguished Member, indeed. I refer to the father of the gentleman from New York, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR., who was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in 1906, and who was responsible for the first act on meat inspection. Since that time this has been paid for out of the Federal Treasury, and the expense runs a little over $11,000,000 a year. That was the figure that came to us to continue it as it always has continued. For a long time I have given some attention to this matter. I have felt that this was a proper charge on the people who are beneficiaries of this inspection. So a provision was written into the bill to make a charge against the industry for the cost involved, for the service that was performed for the Federal Government, to cost $5,000,000 in a revolving fund the first year, and nothing to the Federal Government in the second year. So what is involved is an economy of $6,140,000 this year and $11,140,000 in the years to come.

Now, there have been a great many developments. With reference to this motion made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the House conferees are 6 to 1 in favor of the House position.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman also state that the Senate was entirely on the other side, with the exception of one?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not the responsibility of this House to pass upon the viewpoint of the Senate. We are dealing with the House of Representatives, and six of the seven conferees are in favor of the position taken by the House. Nobody will controvert that, because I made a careful note on the bill.

There have been a great many developments. There have been telephone calls; there have been telegrams; there have been personal calls; there have been rumors. The first rumor I picked up was that inspectors would lose their civil-service status; that they would lose their retirement rights. I chased that down immediately and insisted that word go to every inspector that there would not be any change whatsoever.

The gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, talked about local versus Federal inspection. Those people will continue on the Federal pay roll just as they are this very moment. There will be no change. It is only that the industry will be assessed for the fees that are involved here. The same people, with the same rights they have always had, will continue to do the job. That is why I say that the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, simply missed the point.

Now, it is only fair to this representative jury to give you both sides. So what

were the arguments that were advanced in favor of the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota? Oh, they said the public health in involved. Why, indeed it is. We are just as much interested in the public health as anybody. So what we propose to do probably will be even better for the public health than it has been before. He said that will determine the quality of the inspection. In the Farm Credit Administration we assess every component for the fund and then use the fund to pay people to inspect them. In the Federal home-loan bank set-up we assess all home-loan banks and building-loan associations for a fund and out of that fund pay the inspectors to inspect them.

But here is the pay-off and, Brother GILLIE, I call your attention to this. In 1946 in addition to the $11,140,000 that was appropriated, the inspectors rendered overtime in the packing plants to the extent of $2,406,000. And who paid the bill? The packers paid the bill.

The gentleman says that would diminish the quality of the inspection. How amazing that would be when in the last year over 25 percent of the cost was paid by the packers themselves and they so testified.

They say this cost will be passed back to the consumer. The production of meat is 12,000,000,000 pounds a year. The appropriation here involved is $11,000,000. It is one-tenth of 1 cent a pound. Tell me how you will pass back one-tenth of 1 cent a pound? Somebody said it would be passed back to the livestock producer. It was the contention of my friend from Minnesota. That is the same contention made by Mr. Mueller, Jr., of the American Packing Co., of St. Louis, before the Senate committee. He said you could not pass it on to the consumer because the uninspected packer fixes the price. And then, believe it or not, he said that 30 percent of all the meat on the market today is uninspected—after 40 years of this kind of service. And then he said that it must be passed back to the producer. If the uninspected packer fixes the price for the consumer then how can they argue that the same uninspected packer is not going to fix the price of livestock? He just meets himself coming back, and there is nothing that you can hold to. I have heard every argument. A livestock producer representing producers in Michigan called me off the floor and said that it would be passed on back to the producer of livestock. I said: "My good friend, tell me how?" We argued it there for 30 minutes. He just said it was going to be that way, that is all. That is the only argument there was. And so they meet themselves coming back. Then they said it will not work, it will not work. Well, here is a letter from Dr. Simms, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, dated June 30, 1947, in which he says:

> The regulations are all ready to be signed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

He said they were ready to move in on this proposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Dr. Simms does not in that letter say he is in favor of the change, does he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but Dr. Simms did say in the hearings that the only reason they did not have it on a private basis was that Congress had failed to do it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. He admittted, did he not, that they could not make it work?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted the Members to have all the arguments on both sides. On the one side it is that it will be passed on to the consumer, that it will be passed back to the producer, that it will diminish the quality of the inspection, and so forth. That is the argument against.

What is the argument in favor of this change—and I want the whole argument to be placed before you. The first argument is that it will save $11,000,000 a year, and that, in my book, is a pretty potent argument. The second argument is something that is even more compelling, 25 to 30 pounds out of every 100 pounds of meat sold in the United States right now is out of the so-called intrastate packing plants and it is not inspected. For 40 years we have had meat inspection, yet nearly 1 out of every 3 pounds of meat is not inspected today. And why? It is because we made it so easy that there has been no incentive on the part of the big packers particularly to sell a bill of goods to the people to bring them all in under inspection even in the case of the little fellows who could come in voluntarily. You cannot get at them because they are not in interstate commerce. Is not that an astonishing thing?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

There has got to be an incentive somewhere. We have an analogous situation in the case of the Food and Drug Act of 1906. The people who produced them in great quantities went out, bore down and advertised quality and sold the people on the idea. That is the incentive I have been contending for all along. You will never do it until you put it on a fee basis; then whatever disquality there is because of the fee that attaches on certain packers will make them go out and put the steam on and then the 1 pound out of the 3 pounds of meat uninspected today will finally come under inspection. That is the story in a nutshell. There is no precedent involved here. Why, I started with this thing 4 or 5 years ago, trying to see the equity of it. I do hope that you will stand by the House position.

Let me clarify the parliamentary situation. My motion is that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate. I want that motion to prevail. The gentleman from Minnesota by means of a preferential motion moves that the House recede and concur. I hope that that motion to recede and concur will be voted down and that you will stand by your conferees because six of the seven conferees who passed on this matter are adamant in their views and want the House position sustained.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. May I say that the motive the gentleman has just given is the most compelling motive from the health standpoint that could be offered to sustain his attitude in this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say one further thing. Eight hundred and forty million pounds of meat are transported to other countries. Not a single pound of meat produced in America can go out of this country under our treaties unless it is inspected. Who pays for the inspected meat that the people of Bogota, the Argentine, France, and Italy eat? Why the American taxpayer pays for it. Is it not fair then for the industry to assume that burden on domestic meat, because it is a great sales advantage to be able to say, "There is the blue stamp representing Federal inspection."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true this action of ours will put the meat industry in the same category as other food industries?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I suppose if I were in the packing business I would do what they are doing. I would send a telegram to my Congressman, I would call him by telephone, I would argue the best I knew how and make the best case I knew how. One of my best friends in the business in Chicago argued with me about it. I said, "But you have not given me an argument except that the industry does not want to pay it." I said, "I do not blame you, but the history of progress is that we have got to bring people in under these things in the real interest of public well being."

Mr. Speaker, I hope the preferential motion will be voted down and that the committee position will be sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN), there were—ayes 55, noes 98.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I attempted to obtain time to debate the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. I was in favor of his amendment which would have maintained Federal meat inspection as it has existed for the past 40 years.

The vote has been taken and once again the program of false economy of the Republican leadership has obtained. We have taken away from the people the Federal funds which would have sustained Federal meat inspection for the benefit of the public health.

Federal inspection of meat was established in 1906. In the intervening 40 years we have built up a fine system of uniform inspection. This Federal inspection set of standards for sanitation, animal inspection, and so forth, has been much higher than the average State inspection standards of most States. The people's health, therefore, has been more adequately protected. We are now turning away from the 40-year precedent of independently financed Federal meat inspection. We are turning back to the meat-packing industry the responsibility of financing this program.

In the first place I fear that this is a case where Federal inspection may suffer because of pressure from their paymasters—the packing industry.

In the second place the financial burden will fall most heavily on the independent meat packers. Many of these small packers are desperately fighting against the monopolistic Big Four Meat Trust. The Big Four can pay these charges out of their enormous profits, but the small packers will be pinched further.

In the third place I fear that there will be a further reduction in the number of meat packers which are now using Federal inspection, with a corresponding drop in the quality of our meat.

In the fourth place, we are all aware of the epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, not far from my home State of California. I realize that there is an embargo against importation of Mexican meat and livestock, but this dreaded disease can be carried over the international border by dust, flight of birds, or by small wild animals. If a rigid method of Federal inspection is maintained and such a disease invasion should occur, I maintain that with a full functioning, efficient Federal meat-inspection program in effect we are in a better position to protect ourselves.

We will be able to find such an infection quicker and deal with it more promptly. In my opinion the elimination of Federal meat inspection, independently financed, is false economy against the public interest and a great mistake. I hope the appropriation obtains.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 52, line 8, strike out line 8 and the remainder of the page, all of page 53, all of page 54, all of page 55, and page 56 through line 7 and insert:

"For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $258,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $27,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion going to a State shall not be changed more than 15 percent from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1947, 1948, and 1949 programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1385)) within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels."

Mr. DIRKSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point. It is rather lengthy, and I see no necessity for reading it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 42.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. I raise the question of time. This matter is so vitally important. Has there been any understanding as to

time, or may we expect to have the full hour?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably on this amendment we should have the full hour. I will say that I have tried to parcel out the time so that there will be an equal amount of time granted those for and against the proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we have often heard it said that no votes are changed in debate on the floor. Certainly that should apply to the present situation when this identical question has been debated exhaustively on a number of occasions during the session.

So, I shall content myself, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this is one of the turning points in the postwar history of the country. We are legislating here not merely for the session or the crop year. We are here passing, finally and conclusively, on the question of whether we shall continue the program which has prospered the country and conserved its dwindling natural resources or whether we shall permanently revert to conditions which brought on the most drastic depression of modern times.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand, if we adopt the gentleman's motion we make a commitment not only for the present year, but we also make a commitment in behalf of a conservation of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949. In other words, the motion not only provides for paying our outstanding obligations but also promises a substantial conservation program for the 1948 crop year.

Mr. CANNON. That is perhaps the most important feature of the pending question. As important as it is to keep our contracts with the farmer for the current season, it is even more important that we continue the program which has rehabilitated American agriculture and contributed so largely to the preservation of the fertility of the soil, to the winning of the war, and the promotion of peacetime economy.

As the gentleman indicates, concurrence in the amendment provides funds to pay our contracts with the farmers for the current year and $150,000 toward a continuing program for the next year.

The situation is very well expressed in Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, the most practical and useful farm journal in America. The Farmer and Homestead which has never been accused of partisan bias, certainly not on Democratic leaning, asked:

> Did you sign up for the AAA soil conservation program this year? And were you figuring on help in spreading lime, contouring, plowing under green manure or other soil-conservation practices?
>
> Last year Congress indicated that $300,000,000 would be available to carry out the 1947 AAA conservation program.
>
> But the House of Representatives last week passed and sent to the Senate a USDA appropriations bill which cuts $136,000,000 off this total.
>
> A last-minute attempt to restore the AAA cut was defeated by the narrow margin of 156 to 151.

Later it expressed the opinion that—

> Corn Belt farmers are so used to thinking of the county AAA committees as a permanent institution, almost as permanent as corn cribs, that they probably haven't noticed that the rats are gnawing at the foundations.
>
> Or maybe we should say that the wreckers are getting out the crowbars and dynamite.
>
> Anyway, Congress is talking about cutting the AAA appropriations nearly one-half. Funds for committee work will be trimmed. By next year, so it is planned, there won't be any AAA left.
>
> Most farmers agree that the soil conservation work of Extension, Soil Conservation, and AAA should somehow be put together. But not very many would say the way to do this is to wipe out AAA.
>
> One fine thing about the county AAA committee is that it can be controlled by farmers. Other programs are farther removed from farm control. The AAA can reach everybody, and is subject to a popular farm referendum every year.
>
> No matter what name a farm program is given, these virtues should be retained. After their AAA experience, farmers are not going to be satisfied with any program unless it reaches every farmer and unless farmers get to vote annually for the local committee that runs it.

And in a subsequent issue it said:

> Farmers are indignant and dismayed over the congressional attack on AAA. Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead shares that indignation.
>
> As we have pointed out before, the tough time for farmers comes in the change from war boom prices to normal prices. That's when governmental machinery is needed to keep that change from being a painful collapse.
>
> That is exactly the time when Congress is proposing to take away that needed machinery.
>
> Yet farm people should realize that a congressional drive of this kind doesn't come out of thin air. It has causes, and we'd better see what those causes are.

I know of no farm journal in the country which has expressed any difference of opinion. All national farm organizations have also urged continuance of the program. Their sentiment is aptly expressed by the following telegram from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> JULY 18, 1947.
>
> Hon. CLARENCE CANNON:
>
> On behalf of American Farm Bureau Federation, representing over 1,100,000 farm families in 45 States, I respectfully urge your support of Senate amendments in disagreement by conference committee which provide for agricultural conservation to keep faith with farmers cooperating in 1947 program, and provide for continuation of program in 1948 with adequate administrative funds. Also Senate amendments for school-lunch program, farm-tenant and veterans' loans, and for elimination of fee plan for meat inspection. We favor strict economy, but rejection of foregoing items would be poor economy and would wreck programs vital to farmers and Nation.
>
> EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
> *President.*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri has so well said, we come now to one of the very important postwar agricultural decisions, and the action taken by Congress today will be significant this year and in the years that are to come.

The Congress obligated itself to provide $300,000,000 for the triple-A program for the crop year 1947. It is now a question of whether or not we are going to act in good faith in following through on that program, as I see it. Moreover, the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri provides that the farm program shall be continued in the calendar year 1948. This should be done but the Senate provision should be modified to strike out the $500 limitation.

The Congress should not follow the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in providing a restrictive program for the 1947 crop year and no program at all for the crop year of 1948. It would be a step backward. The gains of agriculture in the past 16 years must not be sacrificed in any such ill-considered action.

I have been approached by those who say, "Don't you know that the farmers of this country are rolling in wealth, and don't you know that they don't need this money, that they have all the money they need and more?" That is wholly fallacious. Let me cite you one fact which completely explodes that argument. That one fact is this: More than two-thirds of the farmers in this country and their families get a gross income from the production on their farms of less than $2,500 a year. A Government clerk in Washington frequently makes more than that. Yes, more than two-thirds of the farmers of this country have a gross income from their farms of less than $2,500 a year. Therefore, it seems to men this argument that the money is not needed is much in error. But if the money were not needed it would make no difference to me, because when the Government has pledged to pay the farmer for cooperating in the farm program and the farmer has gone ahead and fulfilled his obligation, there is nothing in the world for us to do then but carry out that pledge. I am not only hopeful but confident that the House will vote for the $300,000,000 program for this year. There is nothing else for us to do, whether we like it or not, and that is what we will do, in my opinion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. All the authorizations for soil conservation practices have been contingent upon Congress keeping faith with the authorization and providing funds. Is not that true?

Mr. MAHON. That is right. Congress heretofore has always lived up to its AAA program commitments and the producer had no cause to think that Congress would repudate the 1947 program.

Mr. COOLEY. Up until this good year Congress has always kept faith with those authorizations.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, and it must be done again.

Mr. COOLEY. This is the first effort to break faith with the farmers of America.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. And the farmers of America are not too partisan about the farm program. They have shown that in various elections. Agriculture is not a partisan matter. But if the Congress refuses to fulfill its obligation to carry out the $300,000,000 program agreed upon last year the farmer will have good cause to lose faith in Congress. That would be bad business in a democracy; and I for one wish to condemn efforts being made to shirk the responsibility of the Government. It is just a matter of whether or not we are going to fulfill our part of the contract where we have promised to do certain things after the farmer has performed his part of the contract. You cannot make me believe that the Congress will reject that philosophy, and you cannot make me believe that the House is going to do anything other than recede and agree in substance to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What we are actually doing here now is taking away from the farmer's check approximately $130,000,000 which morally belongs to him, and we are taking it away from him in the interest of economy and in the name of economy.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. And it must be admitted it was the intention to set up the $300,000,000 program last year. By the same token it is now proposed to set up $150,000,000 for crop year 1948. The issue is clear cut. There is no room for doubt as to the present duty of Congress in this matter.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. If we do not give the farmers of America this pledge for the next year, it will be impossible to give it to them after Congress convenes next year because then the new crop year will be under way. If the farmers of America are to know how to plan their 1948 activities they must have assurance now as to what the program will be and this motion is the only motion which will give that assurance, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. That is right. An investment in the future of this country to the extent of $300,000,000 is not too much if we are to fulfill our commitments. Yes, the farmer is entitled to know what the 1948 farm program is to be, as has been pointed out by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. Personally, I am convinced that it will be a great mistake if this Congress refuses to authorize a program for the 1948 crop year.

The $150,000,000 program for the crop year 1948 which is provided by the Senate bill is better than nothing. However, the $500 limitation to each participant in the program is unfair and unworkable. The small producer is the man who should be favored in any farm program but the $500 limitation has no place in the AAA program and I hope the conferees will eliminate it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my view is that the position taken by the House originally on this matter should be sustained. Of course, a very considerable sum of money is involved and naturally, as a result of that, much interest has developed in respect to the present item in disagreement.

Sometimes it is said of us that we are for economy in every other place in government except where it affects us. I trust that may never be said of me.

I took the trouble this morning to look up this matter of benefit payments as it applies to my State of Indiana. I discovered it is proposed to spend almost $8,000,000 in Indiana. I asked for a break-down of these figures, and I want to give you those figures in order that you may understand just what sort of purposes this money is going to be devoted to.

First there is:

| | |
|---|---|
| Terracing | $29,000 |
| Establishing sod waterways | 28,000 |
| Contouring intertilled crops | 59,000 |
| Contouring drilled crops | 16,000 |
| Strip cropping | 2,000 |
| Dams for livestock water | 150,000 |
| Tree planting | 4,000 |

Now, those are the sort of things that many people think of as soil conservation. You will observe that is a very small part of the $8,000,000 that they propose to spend out there.

Here is what you get into beyond that:

| | |
|---|---|
| Reseeding pastures | $49,000 |
| Turning under green manure | 245,000 |
| Seeding winter legumes for cover | 2,000 |
| Weed control | 1,000 |
| Harvesting hayseed | 1,034,000 |
| Constructing open farm ditches | 134,000 |
| Installation of tile drainage | 157,000 |
| Application of mulch to commercial orchards | 10,000 |
| Application of lime | 4,481,000 |
| Application of phosphate to conserve crops | 1,168,000 |
| Application of potash to conserve crops | 350,000 |

You will observe that those are the principal items; that is, the last ones, harvesting hayseed, limestone, and fertilizer.

Almost $1,000,000 of that $8,000,000 is to go to the second district—that is the district that I am privileged to represent. I have the breakdown of the apportionment to the counties.

Now, what is the situation with respect to fertilizer and limestone to be advanced to the farmers out there? In what shape are they to buy that if they need it and deem it desirable? According to my home town paper, wheat is now quoted at the Farm Bureau Cooperative Elevator at $2.25. Corn, $2.08. New oats, 92 cents. Old oats, 97 cents. Rye, $2.20. Beans, $3.15.

Now, I ask you, as I asked my farmer friends, who are a conscientious, hard working, frugal and patriotic people, if under the circumstances it is necessary that out of the Federal Treasury we provide money to do all these things enumerated in this breakdown? I understand the problems of the farmers. I am one of them. I also ask my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle who have talked about being for strict economy, but on every occasion that I have observed since this session of Congress opened have fought against every economy that we on our side of the aisle have sought to put into effect——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the gentleman one additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. And then they seek to chide the Republicans for not accomplishing for the people of the country the economy in Government that we set out to accomplish. Well, you cannot blow hot and cold on that proposition. You cannot work both sides of the street. You are either for economy or you are not. Your record in this session of the Congress is clear evidence of the fact that you are not for economy because of your stubborn resistance to every effort we on our side have made to try to put some real economy into Government. Again I say I am not just for economy some place else where it does not affect me—I am speaking only for myself at the moment—but I say if there is to be a cutting down of the expenses of government, then everyone must be prepared to make his contribution to that great cause, and you people on the side of the aisle ought to be a little more helpful in accomplishing that great objective.

I know I speak for the farmers of my district when I say they are for economy and are willing to make their fair share of sacrifice, which all of us must be willing to make. It is not what we might beneficially spend, but how much we can afford. We must ask all groups and all sections of the country to forego certain projects or activities in which they may have a direct interest. We must think of the country as a whole—a huge debt and heavy taxes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman's strictures it will be recalled that in the last Congress we made greater rescissions than had ever been made before or have been made in this Congress. We repeatedly brought in bills providing economy, which were voted down on that side, one after the other. In this Congress on the legislative bill I opposed many of the expenditures for the expenses of the House and Senate, but you insisted on bringing in a larger amount for both Houses than was ever spent before. The trouble with

the gentleman is that the only place he wants to economize is on the farmers of the country, on the children, and on the veterans, as carried in the bill before us. Why does he not come in for economy on all of these other bills in which we have given the great interests everything they have asked for?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, if that is the best answer the gentleman from Missouri can make to what I have just said, I will let the RECORD speak for itself. The fact of the matter is I have been here, I suspect, as much of the time as the gentleman from Missouri. I have been here as we have voted on these amendments to bring about economies all across the board, and I have supported them. I challenge anyone to dispute that by the RECORD, and the gentleman from Missouri has been opposing them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I know of no better economy that can be practiced anywhere in the country than to promote the building of the soil of this great country of ours. Such is the purpose of the amendment under consideration. The bill as it passed the House provided for $165,614,290 for soil-conservation practices during the current year.

No commitment was made in the House bill for a 1948 program. In fact, the House bill contemplated that there would be no program for next year.

I maintained at the time of the passage of the House bill that Congress was committed to appropriate $300,000,000 for the 1947 program. It was my view that $165,614,290 was inadequate to provide for contracts entered into at the time the bill passed the House on May 28, 1947. I argued that farmers who had made expenditures, whose contracts had not been approved, would be discriminated against and I insisted that Congress appropriate the $300,000,000 in accordance with its commitment at the time the appropriation bill was passed in 1946. I maintained that the appropriation carried by the House was inadequate for 1947.

The Senate amended the bill to increase the appropriation to $258,000,000, and to increase materially the limitation of the House on the amounts for administrative expenses. The Senate amendment provided in the second place for a program for 1948, amounting to $150,000,000, with the proviso, and I quote, "and that no participant shall receive more than $500." The Senate amendment may thus be divided into two parts: one to increase the appropriation for 1947, and the second provision for the 1948 crop with a limitation of $500 to any participant.

I believe that the increase for 1947 should be made. I, therefore, favor that part of the Senate amendment providing for the increase to $258,000,000. The payments will not have to be made unless they are earned, unless the participants practice soil building. All who participate spend a great deal more in soil-building practices than they receive under the program. No moneys will be paid unless they are earned. Any balances over and above the earnings will remain in the Treasury.

I favor a program for 1948. I believe, however, that the $150,000,000 is inadequate and that the amount should be increased to at least $250,000,000.

There have been mistakes in the agricultural programs. We have undertaken to profit by these mistakes. The practices now are devoted to the improvement of the soil. They include building pastures, winter cover crops, terracing, and drainage. It is the most satisfactory program ever adopted. It should be continued. It is devoted to building up the soil. It is devoted to increasing production. Adequate appropriation is essential to a sound program. Approximately $300,000,000 has been appropriated for years. The program has grown up around this figure. The amount for 1948 should be increased.

I oppose, however, that part of the Senate amendment that limits participants to $500. The amendment makes it applicable only to 1948. The payments are made for soil building and soil improvement. They must be earned. If a man owns 160 acres of land he cannot earn as much as the man who owns 640 acres, but he will be paid for the payments earned. It is said that the limitation will help the small farmer; but the small farmer must earn his payments to receive them.

Again, the owner of a large farm is entitled to the same consideration as a small farmer. The purpose of the program is to build up the soil whether it is owned by a large farmer or a small farmer. If the practices are to be limited to the improvement of the soil, the small farmer will not be benefited by denying the same benefits to the large farmer. The result will be, however, that the Government will be discriminating and the discrimination will be detrimental especially to tenants and sharecroppers. Large farms can only be operated by tenants or sharecroppers. The tenants and the sharecroppers pay usually a part of the crops as rental. If the lands are built up, they will make larger crops. If the soils are not improved, the sharecroppers and the tenants will suffer. The limitation of $500 is, therefore, a discrimination on the one hand, and on the other hand it will be a gross injustice to the tenants and the sharecroppers who far outnumber the landowners. The benefits to the tenants and the sharecroppers come from the soil-building improvements made by the landlord, and if payment to the landlord is limited, the improvements cannot be made and the tenants thus suffer, for the soil improvements enable the tenants to make more crops.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr DIRKSEN] has moved to further insist upon the House disagreement to the Senate amendment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has moved to recede and concur. If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] prevails, it means that an inadequate program will be adopted for 1948 with a discrimination in payments. If the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] prevails, it means no program for 1948 and an insufficient amount for 1947.

It has been suggested that there be a division of the motion to recede and concur. If this motion is made and prevails, my understanding is that an amendment will be offered to recede and concur with an amendment to increase the House appropriation for 1947 and to eliminate the commitment for 1948. It has been suggested that the limitation of $500 may be made applicable to the 1947 program. This suggestion is unthinkable. Contracts have already been entered into for 1947. In some cases payments have been made. It would be a repudiation of the solemn contracts of the Government. The limitation was intended by the other body to be applicable to 1948. If the 1948 program is rejected by the House and the Senate agrees, the limitation of $500 should also be rejected. We are committed to payments for 1947. The Government must make good its promise. We have made contracts for 1947. It is unthinkable that the Government would undertake to change these contracts after the participants have earned their payments. Congress cannot afford to repudiate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], the former chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

It is often and truly said that the farmer is the backbone of the Nation, but if the farmer does not have the soil he cannot produce. And if the farmer cannot produce he cannot remain the backbone of the Nation. More than that, our soil is the Nation's greatest natural resource and heritage.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the growth and development of this, the greatest Nation on the earth, but it might be well to remind the membership here today that at one time this great country of ours was nothing more than a vast wilderness occupied by the American Indian, in those days there was no problem of soil erosion. Our Indians bothered little with cultivation as we know cultivation today. Their primitive methods of cultivation did not result in soil erosion, but with the advent of the white man the picture gradually changed, and that change has been accentuated in recent years by the development of scientific machines for the cultivation of the soil. First came the felling of the forests. Our lands have largely become denuded as civilization advanced. Intensive cultivation on a wide scale over a period of years has taught the new world what the old one had already learned—merely the necessity for the conservation of the soil.

The soil conservation program has proved to be one of the best investments that this Nation has made. It must be continued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we are faced with a simple proposition. When this agricultural bill was up for consideration in the House last year, a provision was written into it which to all intents and purposes became a solemn obligation of this Government to fulfill. It was agreed that the soil-conservation program for this fiscal year would call for a $300,000,000 outlay by the Federal Government for the purpose of soil conservation. That money was to be matched on a 2 to 1 basis by the farmers of the country. The farmer had every right to expect the Government to carry out the commitment made by Congress. And it does not make any difference now that the Department of Agriculture wrote a provision, in either small or ordinary print, into the contract, which was executed between the Government and the farmers to the effect that it was dependent upon future appropriations.

We all know, as a matter of fact, that farmers, like the most of the rest of us, do not study these contracts when they are presented to them. They were told of the provision that had been made by the Congress, and they expect Congress to keep its part of the bargain. Certainly, it is a moral, if not a legal, obligation that we do so.

When this bill was up in the House last month I voted to recommit it to the committee to place additional funds for this and other purposes, in the bill. I certainly propose to vote now for this amendment, and to do what I can to see that we keep faith with the farmers of this Nation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this program of soil conservation has proved to be a great boon to the farmers of my section. Last year the farmers of my district received approximately $700,000 from this program, and I am advised by the Agricultural Department that if this amendment prevails that they will receive approximately the same amount for the next fiscal year. The amounts received as broken down by counties in my congressional district for last year are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Covington | $80,200 |
| Forrest | 23,890 |
| George | 26,370 |
| Greene | 15,700 |
| Hancock | 12,140 |
| Harrison | 18,200 |
| Jackson | 8,880 |
| Jefferson Davis | 75,780 |
| Jones | 83,220 |
| Lamar | 36,720 |
| Lawrence | 72,680 |
| Marion | 95,350 |
| Pearl River | 88,600 |
| Perry | 15,990 |
| Stone | 17,060 |
| Wayne | 28,450 |
| Total | 699,230 |

But, aside from the result obtained in the conservation program from the expenditure of these funds, there is even a greater benefit that has come to these south Mississippi counties. The farmers are learning, through this program, how to conserve their soil, and thereby not only enriching themselves, but contributing to the enrichment of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that sometimes we forget the fundamentals. The real wealth of this Nation is largely in its farm land, and those who till it. It is interesting to note in this connection that at the time when the first session of this Congress was held approximately 90 percent of the inhabitants of this country were engaged in agriculture. It was the farmer of America who won the freedom and set up this, the most perfect embodiment of free government that any nation in the world has ever enjoyed.

Since that time a great change, of course, has taken place in the lives of the people of this country. And, today in the Eightieth Congress, the efficiency of our per man production on the farm has permitted the release of a large percentage of that labor to other fields of endeavor, and today approximately 80 percent of our labor is engaged in other fields of our economy. But this 80 percent should remember that their welfare is still determined by our farm production. For example, in 1940 our agricultural investment in the United States was approximately $65,000,000,000 as compared to approximately six billion in the combined steel and automobile industry. We can, therefore, understand how some of the representatives from the large urban centers can vote against the interest of the farmer. But if they will take the time to examine the fundamentals of the situation, they will find that it is to the interest of the city dweller, whom they represent, to have a healthy agricultural economy. For they will find on further examination that there can be no prosperity in the cities unless there is first prosperity on the farm. Let me illustrate that briefly by showing that in 1928, a prosperous year, and in 1932, a depression year, agricultural production amounted to about the same. However, in 1928 farm production brought $11,700,000,000 as compared to five billion three million in 1932. In other words, when the farmer could not get an adequate price for his produce in 1932 he could not buy the manufactured products of industry, and the result was that the factory pay rolls were some five billion less in 1932 than they were in 1928.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, permit me to remind our Republican and other friends that as desirable as economy in Government is, and no one is stronger for that than I, false economy such as this is far worse than no economy. I hope that this amendment will pass and that this good work will continue—the essential work of protecting our greatest national resource, our soil.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to refresh the membership on the fact that this is not soil-conservation practices that we are debating here, it is political payments that we are debating. I want to remind the House that we have included in this bill $38,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service. We have included millions for agricultural research administration, for research in soils, fertilizers, and irrigation. We have included millions again for experimentation. There are other millions for the Extension Service. We are not debating that. We are all in agreement on soil conservation.

I want to refresh this House on what the President of the United States said when he was, and we all were, economy minded, and seriously so, last January. He said in his budget message to us:

> A year ago the budget message recommended gradual reduction of these payments and that recommendation is now renewed. More than 60 percent of the total payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. Most of this money thus is being paid to a comparatively small number of farmers who, because of their strong position in American agriculture, would undoubtedly continue the best farm-management practices without the persuasion of a bonus from the Treasury.
>
> We should shift our effort from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service.

We have done that with this bill. We are carrying out the recommendations of the President of the United States in his budget message to us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is one of the most important decisions this Congress or any other Congress has ever had to make. We have got to forget politics; we have got to forget that we are farmers or industrialists, and think about America now and then.

The soil-conservation program is more than a farm program. It is an American program because the strength of this Government depends upon the strength of our topsoil. During our short existence as a Nation we have already whittled our topsoil down from 9 inches to 6 inches. Oh, at one time Egypt had a great bread basket, but they did not preserve the soil. Where is that bread basket today? At one time China had as much good farm land as any nation in the world, but the erosion over the years destroyed it and today China is up against it for food.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we preserve our American soil. Let me give you a few facts. We have 415,000,000 acres of crop land in America. Fifty million of those acres have been absolutely destroyed by soil erosion. Fifty million acres more are practically in the same shape. Out of our 415,000,000 crop-land acres, 280,000,000 acres have been affected one way or another by soil erosion. Why, do you know that soil erosion alone is costing this Nation over $3,800,000,000 a year? And yet this Congress heckles over a paltry $300,000,000 to preserve our soil. A blind man can see what soil conservation has meant to America during the past 12 or 15 years. It has restored thousands upon thousands of acres. It has made the farmer soil-conscious. The

farmers are beginning to learn something about the soil, and the necessity for preserving the soil, and under trained leadership they are beginning to know how. Now, you want to stop that, you want to cut it off beginning next year, and practically cut it off this year, in spite of the fact that we made a commitment to the farmers last year that they would receive $300,000,000 in soil-conservation payments this year.

You can talk to the farmers until you get black in the face, but you will never get a single one of them to concede that this Congress did not make a commitment. We made it. I listened to the chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations stand here in this well and put it up to the House last year. What did he say? "If you do not intend to carry out the $300,000,000 authorization, say so now so you will not mislead the farmers of this country."

Now, this Government rests upon faith and confidence. It is the faith that the people of the United States have in this Government that makes it a strong Government. Here you come along with one fell swoop and do that which is likely to destroy the faith of the farmers of America in their own Government. I do not believe this House will do it. Destroying conservation is a short-sighted policy. The conservation program is not a Democratic policy or a Republican policy. It should be the American policy. Let us look at it in that light.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there are two propositions in the Senate amendment. The first part of the Senate amendment increases the funds proposed by the House from $165,000,000 to $258,000,000 to take care of the program this year. The second part of the Senate amendment proposes to authorize a program for next year in the amount of $150,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. With a possible limitation of $500.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, that is in the Senate amendment, too, and it sets up a program of $150,000,000 for next year. As those of you who heard my remarks when this matter was up before the House, when the bill was under consideration, I cannot personally read the RECORD for last year and see a specific amendment offered at that time to decide the program for this year, and have that approved by the House to authorize setting up a $300,000,000 program for this year, and have it said that that is what it was for, and then come back now and deny the funds necessary to carry it out. I believe there is a moral obligation to carry out the program this year on whatever scale it is actually contracted and performed within the limitations of the law.

Consequently I shall attempt to divide the question when the question comes up for a vote between receding and concurring, and offer a motion to concur with an amendment which will have the effect of striking out the authorization for another year's program but will leave the funds necessary to carry out the program for this year. That, I think, is the honest thing to do in the light of the RECORD last year.

The program in my part of the country is largely a program of building stock water dams. Some of the dams have been constructed; many have been completed and the expense incurred. I believe in furnishing the money to carry out the contracts with the farmers this year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the Majority Leader with reference to the announced program in Indiana. Now, I know nothing about the situation in that State as to whether those programs are worthwhile, as to whether the farmers need these payments, or as to whether the program is necessary. I do not know, and I can only accept his statement for it that they are not needed in Indiana. But, I call his attention to this, that the time for him to have made his speech was last year before the program was announced, before the farmers of his State were told that these were the programs, and before the farmers spent $2 out of their pocket for each one that the Congress is asked here to appropriate out of the Federal Treasury. He is late in bringing up the matter that he discusses here. Now, talk about this program of conservation. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. DIRKSEN—I am very fond of him, and he made a most wonderful speech here in each of the last 2 years—said, "The shortage of food throughout this country is something terrible. I have been throughout the world and I have seen the suffering over there. Now is the time of all times that every farmer should plant every fence corner." He urged them to use every possible inch of ground and to plant everything that they could. That is the simple statement that he made to this Congress; the plea to the American farmer to use every inch of soil that he had, regardless of the bad effects on the fertility. And the farmers of this Nation answered that call, and you have never seen such production throughout the history of this Nation. We saw them deplete their soil in an effort to meet the call that was made on them. Yet though we announced last year a program, though Judge Tarver said, "Gentlemen, if you do not want to commit yourselves to appropriating $300,000,000 next year," which is the present year, "say so now," not a member of this subcommittee opened his mouth in opposition to it.

Those announcements went out. The farmers have acted on them. They have earned this money. As I have said so many times, this is not a case of sending these farmers a blue check, it is a case of saying, "Spend $2 out of your pocket to maintain the health of your soil, and we will pay another dollar, because the Nation has an interest in it."

Here is something I want to call to your attention that I have not heard on the floor so far. We called on industry to do the same thing that my distinguished chairman said the farmers were called on to do. The Congress said, "You must produce, and to enable you to produce we will give you a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract." They did produce, and we did pay them whatever it cost plus another amount. Then Congress passed a bill granting them a tax return of $6,000,000,000 to let them get back to the situation that existed before they were called upon, in other words, reconvert. We called on the farmers in the same way. We made a contract of only $300,000,000 with them, and for the farmers to earn it they must spent $600,000,000 themselves. Yet we find this Republican-dominated Congress, in my judgment, reneging on this contract.

Throughout the years there has been much criticism of the New Deal. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have voted against many things that the so-called New Deal sponsored. I have a record of being opposed to many of those things. Yet this Republican-dominated House of Representatives today is doing one thing that, as far as I know, the New Deal never did, and that is to violate a contract entered into by the Congress of the United States with its own citizens. You violate the full faith and credit of the United States. That is the record you are going to the country on.

You may say, Why should I be disturbed about your politics? I am disturbed about my country. This does not mean anything to me personally as far as deriving any benefits is concerned. I believe my distinguished colleague [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] overstepped himself when he said to his triple-A agent, "You ought not to give me a check for only $300."

He said he had not done the work, but he would take a check for half that amount. I cannot understand that. These folks are supposed to have earned it, and they have earned it. I think that now that you have gotten in control, whether you are for or against this program you ought to set a record of living up to the full faith and credit of the Congress of the United States and of your Government.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this floor a good many times in behalf of the soil-conservation program. In the few moments which I have I make another appeal to this House to make provision for carrying out the soil-conservation payments which we contend the Congress has already committed itself to. When I discussed this matter recently when we had the agricultural appropriation bill before the House, I went into detail and showed how that last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress this House had the

issue squarely put up to it in the presentation made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Tarver. The House at that time did not see fit to include in the appropriation bill a sum sufficient to meet the soil-conservation payments for the year 1947.

The situation now is this—that the Senate has included additional funds up to a total of $295,635,044 for the 1947 crop program. The Senate went further and authorized a similar crop program for the year 1948 to the amount of $150,000,000. The majority party in the House is insisting upon the former figures in the House bill and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has moved to recede and concur in the Senate amendments. If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] prevails, as I hope it will, we will not only have the sum of $295,635,044 for the soil-conservation program for the crop year of 1947, but we will have also something definite for the 1948 program, and that marks a great step forward for the farmers. I say, therefore, to this House that as important as it is to make provision for the program for 1947, it is also of tremendous importance to lay this firm foundation for the 1948 program.

Farmers have to make their plans ahead. No successful farmer can proceed otherwise. The activities of a farm cannot be turned on and off like a spigot. I am therefore delighted to see this provision for 1948 brought before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said so much in behalf of the value of soil conservation on different occasions on this floor that I hope that it is not now necessary to reiterate all of the arguments for it. One cannot travel into any farm community in the Nation, and especially in the South, without seeing abundant reasons for the conservation of our soils. The evidence of the necessity of continuing and even increasing the soil-conservation program is written in eroded and worn-out fields, in filled-up rivers and valleys, in marginal lands, in poor production, and in countless other ways. America, with all of her great resources, her fertile valleys, her vast agricultural enterprises, is fast depleting and using up her soils and unless drastic measures are taken to check this trend, there may come a time when this country will not be able to sustain itself agriculturally. There is just so much soil, Mr. Speaker. We are told that it takes 100 years to build 1 inch of soil. We were told years ago that we were losing our soil at the rate of about 300,000 acres a year. It seems to me that this presents a problem so serious and so important to the welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country that it is incumbent upon this Congress to make full provision for this important work.

The motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will go far in this direction, although even the Senate bill did not provide as much as I would like to see provided for this important work. But that motion will substantially carry out what we contend was the solemn obligation made by Congress last year. I therefore urge this House to support the motion to recede and concur and to thus provide the full sum stipulated therein and thus carry out a solemn obligation to our farmers and thereby also make substantial provision for the 1948 crop year. I make this appeal that this House stand by our farmers. They produced abundant crops with short labor, with a great shortage of machinery, and under many other handicaps during the war. Because of the great sacrifice made by our farmers, our country today has ample supply of food. I plead with you not to short-change our farmers. Let us give them our full support. Support the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has stricken out the House appropriation of $165,000,000 for soil conservation payments for 1947 and has substituted for this figure the total sum of $295,635,044 for the 1947 crop program and has authorized for the 1948 crop program an additional sum of $150,000,000. I am very much in favor of the Senate amendment. As I have said repeatedly on the floor of the House, one of the most worthy programs of the Agriculture Department is its soil conservation program. This program has meant hundreds of millions of dollars in added wealth to the people of the United States and without it our farmers could not begin to supply the world-wide clamor for American food at the present time.

I understand that a motion may be made at a later date to amend the Senate provision by striking out the $150,000,000 authorized for the 1948 program and will amend it further by reducing the total amount of $295,635,044 by some $50,000,000. I intend to vote against this amendment and I intend to do everything possible to bring the total amount appropriated as near as possible to the $300,000,000 needed for the 1947 crop program. Any lesser sum than that recommended by the Agriculture Department for this purpose will result in false economy and in hurtful practices for our farmers.

I especially am going to oppose any effort to strike out the $150,000,000 authorized for the 1948 crop program. This amount as low as it is means a distinct reduction of the amount needed by our farmers for soil conservation payments. To strike this out means a discontinuance of the soil conservation payments and as a result it means a severe if not fatal blow to all soil conservation practices. Such action by this House will be little short of tragic to our farmers and I urge that the membership pause before taking such action. I hope the Senate provisions will be maintained without amendment and without reduction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the increased appropriations provided by the Senate for soil-conservation payments. I disapprove of the limitation of $500 for participants in the program for the crop year of 1948. I strongly support the soil-conservation program to be made available to the farmers of the Nation for the year 1948 and future years.

When the Agriculture appropriation bill was before the House I supported an increase in the amount from $165,000,000 to $300,000,000 for soil-building practices. The House approved the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations of $165,000,000. This amount is grossly inadequate for the current year. The commitments have been made by this Congress to provide $300,000,000 in benefit payments for the current year. We cannot and must not go back on our word to the Nation's farmers who have relied on the promises that have been made and carried out their contracts.

The provision written into this bill by the Senate in which you say to the farmers and their tenants that you cannot receive more than $500, regardless of the amount to which you may be entitled, by virtue of complying with the program is discriminatory, unfair, and unjust. You are in effect saying that because a man has worked hard all his life and acquired two or three hundred acres of land the program is not intended for him. That is a short-sighted position to take—it is just as essential to terrace, sod, and lime a farm of two, three, or five hundred acres as a farm of 80 acres. To have a successful and workable program to conserve the Nation's soil, for all time to come, no distinction should be made.

Under the Senate limitation of $500 to each participant no consideration is given the share croppers or tenants who farm small plats of land as a part of a large tract. No provision is made for him. Mr. Speaker, I speak for that man and say to you that he is left out of all benefits solely because he happens to cultivate land on a large farm. I am pleading for the same consideration to all farmers, share croppers and tenants alike, without distinction and without discrimination. A large farm is simply an aggregation of small farms. One landowner cannot be expected to farm more than a few acres himself—so he obtains farm tenants to help him farm his land—why should not this program apply to him too?

I trust that when the House conferees meet with those from the Senate you will remove this objectionable $500 limitation in the interest of equity, fairness, and justice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are lending money to Mexico to buy mules and tractors for Mexican farmers. We are giving money to farmers in European countries in the form of seed, fertilizers, and machinery. We are paying for cattle owned by Mexicans which are being killed to stop the spread of the hoof-and-mouth disease. We are seriously discussing a proposed program of $5,000,000,000 a year to be sent to Europe to stop the spread of communism.

It seems that American money and resources are unlimited when it is the needs of other nations we are considering. While our hearts bleed freely for the woes of other countries, they are flinty and hard where our own are concerned.

I have heard gentlemen say that they oppose giving fertilizer and ground limestone to the farmers of America. It is well known to the membership of this House that we are and have been giving fertilizer to European farmers. Why is it praiseworthy and virtuous to give away fertilizer to farmers overseas, and yet wasteful and reprehensible to do the same for our own farmers.

I earnestly hope that we will concur in the Senate amendments to increase the soil-conservation money and also to increase the school-lunch money to $75,000,000. Certainly our children are as dear to us as the children overseas. Certainly we are as willing to be taxed to afford adequate nutrition for our own children.

Some of the opponents of the school-lunch program undertake to justify that opposition by saying that the school-lunch program is the responsibility of the States and not of the Federal Government, and that the States have all the money needed to finance the program. I say that this is not correct. I say that as a Nation-wide proposition the States are not adequately financing their educational programs. I recall that in March of this year when the gentleman from New York the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House was arguing on the floor that the States have plenty of money, and should themselves finance the school-lunch program, almost at that very moment school teachers in his home State of New York were on strike because they were underpaid. I cannot recall any State which claims that it pays its school teachers all they are worth. They are underpaid in my home State, and I believe the same condition exists all over this country.

The Senate has wisely restored the funds for soil-conservation payments to the farmers, and the $75,000,000 for the school-lunch program. I heartily favor these appropriations and hope that we in the House will concur in that action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, this is not a question of keeping faith with the farmers because everyone knew and was chargeable with notice that this was not an obligation of the Government unless appropriations were made by the Congress. The most outstanding fact about this perhaps is that it is a provision for the limestone and fertilizer trust.

The limestone trust and fertilizer trust have circularized my district. I had a summary of their operations. They circularized the district of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. Their representatives came around to me with this mimeographed statement showing where the folks were supposed to stand. This was before the agricultural bill came up in the House. This gentleman, Robert M. Koch, stated to me that unless I supported that provision for the benefit of the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust that the farmers in my territory would defeat me.

Oh, I welcome just that kind of stuff. I have never had a farmer in my district speak to me in favor of it. After this bill was passed in the House of Representatives I received from farmers numerous communications that had been sent to them by the AAA committee, in violation of the law, trying to lobby and propagandize in favor of this proposition, and trying to get them to write to me. They wrote to me on the back of these circulars and all opposed it. They said, "We have had enough of this kind of a raid on the Treasury of the United States. We are sick and tired of seeing bags of fertilizer lying around in the corners of the fields and bags of limestone lying around the corners of the fields being spoiled and wasted. We do not want any more of this program." I have never had one of them write to me in favor of it, and I have a large agricultural district.

Now, is it not time that we stopped this subsidy business? I do not believe that the farmer wants to be subsidized. I know that the farmers in my territory do not.

This is not the primary soil conservation item in the bill. The primary soil conservation item has already been amply provided for by the committee, and that is where the soil conservation practices originate, and that is where they are taken care of by the Government of the United States. It is a proper activity, insofar as it is properly conducted. I hope it will continue to be so conducted. But let us stop appropriating money for the benefit of the fertilizer trust and the limestone trust and pretending it is for the benefit of the farmers of the United States. I cannot do that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I always like to hear my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] make a speech. He is getting more artistic every day, and he has been something of an artist for a long, long time. When he goes to set up a straw man he sets up one in due form.

He does not want to give this money for soil conservation. Just why, I do not know, except that he committed himself to the small task of reducing the budget $6,000,000,000. Therefore, he sets up the fertilizer trust.

Now, I never saw the fertilizer trust. I never saw a representative of it. I never had a communication from them that has ever been called to my attention. But I have never seen a representative of the fertilizer trust and I have never had a communication from one; but in these reductions, when they start to take it out of the hide of the fellow who responds every time he is called upon, in war or in peace, then they have got to set up a straw man to kick around.

I repeat what I said to you when this bill was before the House some weeks ago, that the most important, the most vital domestic problem we have is what we are going to do with what fertility is left in our soil. If over the next 25 years we proceed with the same recklessness in the destruction of the fertility of this soil that we have in the last 50, the farmers of the great Middle West and the West and South will not be looking for a place to sell their surplus, they will be looking for a place to raise what we eat, what we wear, and what we need inside the United States. It does not cost any fertilizer, it does not pay anything to the fertilizer trust to terrace land, alluvial land that washes away. I believe the gentleman from Iowa has some of that same sort of land that was built up by grass for centuries. It is the worst land to erode in the world if it is not taken care of because the rains will gut it, and that has happened in my country and I am sure in other country like mine, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and many other sections.

We plowed up the prairies, we did nothing to conserve them. They started to wash. Then in many instances we went down into the valleys, the rich valleys, and cut the trees away. We left nothing to hold the ground, nothing to stop the dirt that flowed down from the slopes. The water that flowed down from the slopes filled up the channels that the creeks did have before the slopes and valleys were cleared up. That soil has filled the creeks or the streams or the channels that used to exist and now when it rains on the slopes the water has no place to run except to spread all over the fertile valley and destroy it. Today millions of acres of ground, millions of acres of that fertile soil, are in Johnson grass, in elms and in willows and has passed out of cultivation.

It does not take any fertilizer to dig a ditch. It does not take any fertilizer to sod some grass. It does not take any fertilizer to build a terrace to slow up the flow of water and keep it from carrying the fertile soil down into the great bottoms into the rivers and into the sea. And the fertilizer trust and that straw man will not answer the man who wants to conserve his soil, who wants an acre to produce more than it is producing now in its depleted form.

I care not whether you come from city, country, or town, you are going to regret it in the very next few years to come if you do not conserve what fertility is left in our soil and fix our soil so that fertility can be reestablished in it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about this issue for two reasons: First, with regard to the Congress of the United States. If we fail in this instance—and hear me, please—it will be the first time in my services as a Member of the Congress that the Congress has failed to carry out its own promises. I have here the appropriation act we passed last year for the Department of Agriculture.

Here is the language in that act:

> Such amounts shall be available for salaries and other expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of 1947 program amounting to $300,000,000.

That is a positive direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to inaugurate the soil-conservation program this year and

obligated us to appropriate the money. I hope the Congress will not falter in its promise.

Secondly, I am concerned with regard to the treatment the Congress will accord the farmers of this Nation. We are not very far beyond the date when this Congress and our Government were appealing to the farmers of this Nation for an enormously increased production for war purposes. Now that the farmers have greatly depleted their soil to meet that request they need increased amounts of fertilizer and limestone, if you please, yet we are told here that so soon after the end of the war we must withdraw from them this support and assistance.

This program has been called a subsidy. I can agree to no such charge against the program. But let us assume for a moment that it is a subsidy. I went into the Appropriations Committee rooms a few minutes ago and I asked how much money this Congress this month had appropriated for the retirement fund of the Government employees. Do you know what they told me? $244,000,000. You have voted that amount already as a contribution to put into the retirement fund for Government employees, not one of whom produces a pound of food, but every one of whom must live upon the food produced by the man who works out yonder in the sun. You tell me that it is all right to give $244,000,000 to those people, and I approve of it heartily, yet it is not right to make some contribution to the preservation, the restoration, and fertility of our soil, our greatest natural resource. We have in this country 10 percent of all the soil in the world that is fit for cultivation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first let me say a word about the parliamentary situation. A motion was made to insist on the House position, which is the position that we, the majority of the subcommittee, will take in this matter. The preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] calls for receding and concurring in the Senate amendment. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will request a division of the question and in consequence the vote will come first on the motion to recede. I trust that motion will be voted down and that the House position will be maintained so that we can take this back to conference and determine what the ultimate result shall be.

Let us look at the equities of the matter for a moment. When the matter came up in budget form there were requests of $301,000,000 for so-called soil-conservation payments. At that point let me make a very clear distinction, because it is constantly confusing. There are two bureaus in the Department of Agriculture that deal with soil conservation. The first one is the Soil Conservation Service as distinguished from soil conservation. It has 10,000 or more people on its pay roll. It has offices in every section of the country. This bill carries $39,000,000 for that purpose, and there is a sufficient sum for soil research. Those people will do this work on erosion and give farmers technological information on how to go about the business of soil-conserving practices. That is not involved here. These are payments for planting trees. These are payments for terracing. These are payments for putting lime on the earth and all that sort of thing, but the technological service is not involved here. That is a wholly different question. So, I want to make that distinction.

Now, the request was for $301,000,000 plus. What did we do with it in the committee as approved by the House? We left in $150,000,000 for payments. That is in the House bill. We provided $15,000,000 for administrative expenses in the field. Now comes the Senate and modifies the handiwork of the House of Representatives, and what do they do? They restore $267,000,000 for payments; in other words, they increased the House figure for payments by $117,000,000. Secondly, they increased the operating expenses from $15,000,000 to $27,500,000. The third thing they did was to put in a provision for a program in crop year 1948, which does not appear in the House bill, for a very good reason. It was their belief that there was going to be a program. Then, the fourth thing that the Senate did was to put a limitation of $500 on the payment to any participant, and that is the matter to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] so well addressed you a little while ago.

Now, what is the argument? Let us look at the argument on both sides of the fence. They say there is a moral commitment here. Well, I have battled over that thing a long time, and I thought it was plain that they were contingent upon appropriations by the House. The literature of the Department, the forms that are sent to every farmer, contain print on their face or somewhere. It is not the fine print that they talk about, but good, legible print, that this is dependent upon appropriations by the Congress of the United States. So, that is not involved here, notwithstanding all the statements that were made.

It is said, "All right, but work has already been done and commitments have already been made." The Department told us through our executive secretary that only $36,000,000 has been committed, and that can be easily administered and that can be easily managed. Now, those are the principal arguments, plus the fact that we are dealing here with a national resource. Nobody quarrels with that contention, but our contention is that the first fruit of that resource goes to the man who owns the land in fee simple, or who administers it or who manages it, and he has some responsibility, do you not believe, in addition to the Federal Government? So, we simply say we have not taken away all the money. We believe, however, according to the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the productivity of agriculture has reached a peak in 1946 and 1947, with the lowest per capita debt among farmers, the largest amount of Liberty bonds and Government bonds and Victory bonds and cash in the bank, and that in a year like that the farmer can, and I am persuaded that he is patriotic enough that he will undertake a portion of the responsibility and the cost of soil conservation.

Now then, let us look at the other side. That is one argument that I would advance. If it could not be done in 1946, when, gentleman, can it be done? And if it cannot be done in 1947, will we ever see the time when agriculture is so prosperous as it is now, with prices as high as they are now, that they can undertake some of this responsibility?

Now, you would think for all the world that we were trying to emasculate the whole soil conservation program. Ask the experts, and what do they tell you?

That the maximum amount in the Budget Bureau would equal only 20 percent of our soil requirements. So by cutting it some we subserve the good cause of economy and the fiscal integrity of the country, and percentagewise the reduction in soil conservation activities so far as payments are concerned is very small.

I made the contention a long time ago that if you are going to do something in this field the man who can least afford to carry the job ought to be helped a little more than he is, but does he get all the fruit? I say to you on my responsibility now that out of 3,400,000 farmers who participate in this program 650,000 get 60 percent of the money. It ought to be selective and it is not. I made that suggestion but it failed at the time. The Senate committee wrestled with that but for some reason or other those who were promoting it could not get anywhere with the idea of making it selective and giving the little farmer a little larger break in this whole program.

If we are going to shed tears about it, then let us shed tears about the small farmer who farms from 3 acres up, and who is having the greatest difficulty. Yet those farmers get so little of the money—2,750,000 farmers get $100,000,000 while 650,000 farmers get $167,000,000.

I have a farm district, with six counties entirely agricultural. I have been dealing with the leaders for a long time. I am just as sensitive to them as anyone. I am always grateful for their suffrage. They have helped to send me here, and I seek to discharge my responsibility to them. But I am not unmindful that we are not dealing with a sentimental problem. You cannot take farmers and put them over here, and labor here, and industry there, and on that basis legislate for each one, and then keep the fiscal integrity of the country from being impaired. It is so easy to say, "Yes; we have sent money abroad." Yes; we have. I am for that, and I will tell you why. I hope that by these expenditures that we make in that field now we add to the moral defense of this country on the outside, and that in a few years it will not be necessary to come in here every year with a security budget for the Army and Navy of $12,000,000,000. So do not be deluded by that argument.

Soil conservation will go on. The ability to pay and to conserve is there. I am confident that out of organized agriculture there will be no great protest over a cut like this. So let us take this back to conference, let us wrestle with the Senate some more and see what we can work out of this in conference. In so doing, I trust that when the motion is divided and the first question is, will the House recede, we will vote that down, and then we have taken care of this matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman inform the House as to the probability of an additional allowance being brought in for the county and township committees? There are a few that are fearful there is not quite enough money for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. We have discussed this matter informally, and I believe there was a general opinion in the committee that probably that ought to be agreed to.

Let me emphasize to you the distinction between these two agencies. The soil conservation, which has $39,000,000 in this bill, has 10,000 or more people on the pay roll and has over 2,200 field offices scattered all over. It spends over $300 a farm, by its own testimony, to help the farmers conserve soil. It got out over 33,000 plans last year. That is one agency that is not involved here. This deals with payments to farmers and with administrative expenditures to 107,000 county and community committeemen. So I ask you to vote down the motion to recede when it is voted on after the question is divided, and in that noble institution known as the conference I am confident we can work out something.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that these authorizations were made contingent upon the appropriation of money by Congress, but the fact is that that situation has existed through the years and the farmers have relied in good faith upon the Congress appropriating the money. Does not the gentleman agree that there is at least an implied agreement that Congress will keep faith with these people who have complied with the contracts they have made with the Government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language of the bill plus the discussions by the Department of Agriculture itself with respect to the contingency of appropriation is so clear and has been made so abundantly clear to every farmer that there can be no question about it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on this question, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this vote, as I understand it, is on the division requested by the gentleman from South Dakota, and the question is: Will the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment as distinguished from receding and concurring and that the vote is "no"; not to recede.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that might be.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I could make the proper answer to that inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if the motion to recede should carry, then it will be in order, will it not, for me to offer a motion to concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 187, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—204

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Clark | Evins |
| Albert | Clason | Fallon |
| Allen, La. | Clippinger | Feighan |
| Almond | Colmer | Fernandez |
| Andresen, August H. | Combs | Fisher |
| Andrews, Ala. | Cooley | Flannagan |
| Barden | Cooper | Fogarty |
| Bates, Ky. | Corbett | Folger |
| Battle | Cox | Forand |
| Beckworth | Cravens | Gary |
| Bell | Crosser | Gathings |
| Bennett, Mo. | Cunningham | Gordon |
| Blatnik | Davis, Ga. | Gore |
| Boggs, La. | Davis, Tenn. | Gorski |
| Bonner | Davis, Wis. | Gossett |
| Boykin | Dawson, Ill. | Granger |
| Brooks | Deane | Grant, Ala |
| Brown, Ga. | Delaney | Gregory |
| Bryson | Dingell | Hagen |
| Buchanan | Dolliver | Hardy |
| Buckley | Domengeaux | Harless, Ariz. |
| Bulwinkle | Donohue | Harris |
| Burleson | Dorn | Harrison |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Doughton | Hart |
| Camp | Douglas | Havenner |
| Cannon | Drewry | Hedrick |
| Carroll | Durham | Heffernan |
| Case, S. Dak. | Eberharter | Hendricks |
| Chelf | Elliott | Heselton |
| Chenoweth | Ellis | Hill |
| | Engle, Calif. | Hobbs |
| Hoeven | Meade, Md. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Holifield | Miller, Calif. | Rohrbough |
| Hope | Mills | Rooney |
| Huber | Monroney | Sabath |
| Hull | Morgan | Sadowski |
| Jackson, Wash. | Morris | Sasscer |
| Jarman | Morrison | Schwabe, Mo. |
| Johnson, Ind. | Muhlenberg | Sikes |
| Johnson, Okla. | Mundt | Simpson, Ill. |
| Jones, Ala. | Murdock | Smathers |
| Jones, N. C. | Murray, Tenn. | Smith, Maine |
| Karsten, Mo. | Murray, Wis. | Smith, Va. |
| Keefe | Norrell | Smith, Wis. |
| Kefauver | Norton | Snyder |
| Kennedy | O'Brien | Somers |
| Kerr | O'Konski | Spence |
| Kilday | Pace | Stanley |
| King | Passman | Stevenson |
| Klein | Peden | Stigler |
| Lane | Peterson | Stratton |
| Lanham | Philbin | Talle |
| Larcade | Phillips, Tenn. | Taylor |
| LeCompte | Pickett | Teague |
| Lemke | Poage | Thomas, Tex. |
| Lesinski | Preston | Trimble |
| Lucas | Price, Fla. | West |
| Lusk | Price, Ill. | Wheeler |
| Lyle | Priest | Whitten |
| Lynch | Rabin | Whittington |
| McCormack | Rains | Williams |
| McMillan, S. C. | Rankin | Wilson, Ind. |
| Madden | Rayburn | Wilson, Tex. |
| Mahon | Redden | Winstead |
| Manasco | Richards | Wood |
| Mansfield | Rizley | Worley |
| Marcantonio | Robertson | Zimmerman |
| Martin, Iowa | Robsion | |
| Meade, Ky. | Rockwell | |

NAYS—187

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Gearhart | Merrow |
| Allen, Ill. | Gillette | Meyer |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Gillie | Michener |
| Anderson, Calif. | Goff | Miller, Conn. |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Goodwin | Miller, Md. |
| Angell | Graham | Miller, Nebr. |
| Arends | Grant, Ind. | Mitchell |
| Arnold | Griffiths | Morton |
| Auchincloss | Gross | Nixon |
| Bakewell | Gwinn, N. Y. | Nodar |
| Banta | Hale | Norblad |
| Barrett | Hall, Leonard W. | O'Hara |
| Bates, Mass. | Halleck | Owens |
| Beall | Hand | Patterson |
| Bender | Harness, Ind. | Phillips, Calif. |
| Bishop | Herter | Ploeser |
| Blackney | Hess | Plumley |
| Boggs, Del. | Hinshaw | Potts |
| Bolton | Holmes | Poulson |
| Bradley | Horan | Ramey |
| Bramblett | Howell | Reed, Ill. |
| Brehm | Jackson, Calif. | Reed, N. Y. |
| Brophy | Javits | Rees |
| Brown, Ohio | Jenison | Reeves |
| Buck | Jenkins, Ohio | Rich |
| Buffett | Jenkins, Pa. | Riehlman |
| Burke | Jennings | Rogers, Mass. |
| Busbey | Jensen | Ross |
| Butler | Johnson, Calif. | Russell |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Johnson, Ill. | Sadlak |
| Canfield | Jones, Ohio | St. George |
| Carson | Jones, Wash. | Sanborn |
| Case, N. J. | Jonkman | Sarbacher |
| Chadwick | Judd | Schwabe, Okla. |
| Chiperfield | Kean | Scoblick |
| Church | Kearney | Scott, Hardie |
| Clevenger | Kearns | Scrivner |
| Coffin | Keating | Seely-Brown |
| Cole, Kans. | Kersten, Wis. | Shafer |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kilburn | Short |
| Cotton | Kunkel | Simpson, Pa. |
| Coudert | Landis | Smith, Kans. |
| Crawford | Latham | Springer |
| Crow | Lea | Stefan |
| Curtis | LeFevre | Stockman |
| Dague | Lewis | Sundstrom |
| Dawson, Utah | Lodge | Taber |
| Devitt | Love | Tibbott |
| D'Ewart | McConnell | Tollefson |
| Dirksen | McCowen | Towe |
| Dondero | McDonough | Twyman |
| Ellsworth | McDowell | Vail |
| Elsaesser | McGarvey | Van Zandt |
| Elston | McGregor | Vorys |
| Engel, Mich. | McMahon | Vursell |
| Fellows | McMillen, Ill. | Wadsworth |
| Fenton | Mack | Weichel |
| Fletcher | MacKinnon | Welch |
| Foote | Macy | Wigglesworth |
| Fulton | Maloney | Wolcott |
| Gamble | Mason | Wolverton |
| Gavin | Mathews | Woodruff |
| | | Youngblood |

ing amendment which limits the benefits under the act to $500 per participant. This is a splendid opportunity for the Congress to work its will for the small farmer, and also probably save a little money.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that on this particular motion nobody on the Democratic side had an opportunity of expressing his views. I do not ask the Chair to recognize anyone, because then we will be here for an hour; I recognize that. But, at least the gentleman from Illinois, I think, ought to yield 10 minutes to somebody on this side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would concur if it were not for the fact that I believe the issue that is before us is abundantly clear, and I doubt very much whether any further discussion would add to clarification.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a more fundamental question involved than the gentleman's own personal opinion. I would suggest, in the light of the circumstances, where two Members on the gentleman's side have been recognized, if anyone on this side wants to speak for 5 or 10 minutes, that the nice thing to do would be to yield 5 or 10 minutes to somebody on this side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have been here since 10 o'clock this morning, and we have given over the whole day to the conference report, with the exception of roll calls. I undertook to yield as generously as I knew how.

Mr. WHITTEN. In view of the gentleman's statement a moment ago in reply to the gentleman from Georgia——

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman from Mississippi, who is a member of the subcommittee, would like to have 5 minutes, I would be very delighted to yield, and thereafter the previous question will be moved.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Illinois in granting me this time, but I would like to call the attention of Members here, particularly those who voted to recede on the majority side, to this fact. The gentleman from South Dakota made his motion for the reason that he felt that the Congress committed itself to this program last year. On the basis of that suggestion and of his motion based on that thought, the motion to recede was carried. Now, I say to him—and there is not a fairer minded man in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE—but I say to him, to follow up his original motion with something that does not carry out the commitments, which might be termed only half way repudiation, is no different from full repudiation.

I say to those Members who voted to recede, if you did so in the belief that this Congress and the Nation are committed to the farmers who have earned these payments, if you did that in the thought and in the belief that we had so committed ourselves, you do not help yourselves by coming back and saying, "No; we will halfway repudiate."

This is the situation with regard to the Senate amendment. It provided for carrying out the full commitment for the rest of the year, and for a program next year of $150,000,000, except that next year the maximum payment should be limited to $500. The gentleman from South Dakota offered an amendment striking out the language with reference to setting up a program for next year of $150,000,000 but leaving in the $500 limitation. Whether or not the program that has been carried on through the years is sound, whether or not you want to strike out the program for next year, certainly you do not want to go along with this motion which takes out the Senate provision for next year but leaves in a $500 limitation which limitation then becomes effective on this year's program. You say to the man with whom the contract has been made, "Though you have done the work on thousands of acres, though you have spent $2 out of your own pocket for each one the Government may pay, in the interest of saving money we are going to violate each and every one of those contracts."

I am not personally interested in this matter. I get no benefits from the Government. But you authorized those contracts and the Department of Agriculture made them. The Senate recognized that they were contracts. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] recognizes that they were contracts. But by striking out the language which his motion would leave out, you leave the $500 limitation where it may well be brought forward to this year's program and, in effect, you have violated each contract the Department of Agriculture executed with the farmers of this Nation. Certainly those of you who voted for this motion to recede on the ground that you wanted to live up to the commitments of this Congress do not want to do that. In effect, you now come along and say that you are going to violate the contracts half way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with me that any farmer who would get as much as $500 under this program would probably be smart enough to read his contract and see in there that getting the money depends on the making of the appropriation.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the distinguished majority leader, and there is no keener mind here than his, will read that language, he will find that what that language in the contract meant was this, that of the $300,000,000 which this Congress committed itself to last year, the farmer could look only to his pro rata share of that, and if the farmers of the Nation earned $600,00,000 through carrying out the program he would be limited to his pro rata share of the $300,000,000 which the Congress had committed itself to in this year's program.

I say it is bad business to say to the American farmer, "You have to read the small print. If you do not, your Government will take advantage of it after you have spent your money and after you have furnished your contribution. After the Government has said it is interested in the fertility of your soil and that you should carry on the work, we are going to pull this back, after you have spent your share." I do not believe you want to do that. I do not believe you want to go to the country on that basis. I do not believe that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], honorable gentleman that he is, having sponsored the original motion on the ground that the Congress ought to live up to its commitments, would now want to say, "Let us just halfway live up to them." I hope you will vote his motion down.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the limitation of $500 payment to any person participating in the farm program included in this bill by the Senate is similar to one I have tried to insert in this legislation for a number of years. Soil conservation payments were intended to assist the farmer who operates the family sized farm. One of the difficulties with this program in the past has been that, of the millions of dollars appropriated, most of it has been paid to the big operators who do not need it at all.

Only few people know the average payment is much less than $100. In fact 80 percent of approved funds have been paid to 20 percent of those who participated in the program.

This bill now includes—with the amendment under consideration—$225,000,000 for soil conservation payments. With the limitation of $500, every farmer who has been getting less than $200, should not have his payments reduced from what they were last year. I should give the man who operates an average sized farm a fairer deal. In the past, the Government has paid funds by the thousands, and even hundreds of thousands—in some cases—while the small operator got less than $75.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 171, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—218

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Blackney | Clason |
| Allen, Ill. | Boggs, Del. | Clevenger |
| Almond | Bolton | Clippinger |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bradley | Coffin |
| | Bramblett | Cole, Kans. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Brehm | Cole, N. Y. |
| Andresen, August H. | Brophy | Corbett |
| | Buck | Cotton |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Buffett | Coudert |
| Angell | Burke | Crawford |
| Arends | Busbey | Crow |
| Arnold | Butler | Curtis |
| Auchincloss | Byrnes, Wis. | Dague |
| Bakewell | Canfield | Davis, Wis. |
| Banta | Carson | Dawson, Utah |
| Barrett | Case, N. J. | Devitt |
| Bates, Mass. | Case, S. Dak. | D'Ewart |
| Beall | Chadwick | Dirksen |
| Bender | Chenoweth | Dondero |
| Bennett, Mo. | Chiperfield | Ellis |
| Bishop | Church | Ellsworth |

Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fulton
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harness, Ind.
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Ohio
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lewis
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
O'Hara
Owens
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Taylor
Tibbott
Tolefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—171

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hagen
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hedrick
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Hope
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kearney
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Klein
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
Lemke
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield,
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pace
Passman
Peden
Peterson
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rankin
Rayburn
Rayfiel
Redden
Richards
Rizley
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sadowski
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stigler
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Trimble
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—41

Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Bonner
Boykin
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Celler
Chapman
Clements
Cole, Mo.
Eaton
Fuller
Gallagher
Gifford
Gwynne, Iowa
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hartley
Hays
Hébert
Heffernan
Johnson, Tex.
Kee
Kelley
Kirwan
Ludlow
Norrell
Norton
O'Toole
Patman
Pfeifer
Powell
Rabin
Riley
Rivers
Sabath
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Thomas, N. J.
Thomason
Vinson
Walter

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Boykin.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. REED of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 104, Rept. No. 997), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and invesigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof:

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind of nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors:

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes and zoning laws contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Federal, State, and municipal government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of senographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the

Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 296, Rept. No. 998), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions; and

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress; and

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other; and

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee on foreign aid composed of 19 Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources and facilities available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs; (4) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than March 1, 1948.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, either within or without the continental limits of the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "adjourned," strike out the words "to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 295, Rept. No. 999), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs was established in 1822, and by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (1) has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and (2) is charged to exercise continuous watchfulness over the execution by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government of the laws relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally; and

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States today assumes new importance in the operations of the entire economic system of the United States and conditions the survival of free institutions both at home and abroad; and

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs has, by its reorganization in conformity with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, by setting up the appropriate staff and subcommittee organization to deal with the heavy new burden imposed upon it to make recommendations to the House of Representatives on policy issues affecting foreign affairs and on the necessary legislative action: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittees is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. That in projects for studies of matters concerning the foreign affairs of the United States which in the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs require investigations by it abroad, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff and clerical help, to accompany subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on such investigations or study missions abroad.

SEC. 3. That in making such studies and investigations abroad, it shall be the duty of such subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to keep current records and to make reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for appropriate legislative action, on the completion of any such mission, of the results of such studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittees thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 314, Rept. No. 1000), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3465) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideraton of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 315, Rept. No. 1001), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 29

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to file minority views on the bill H. R. 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to say that I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and he has informed me that the deficiency appropriation bill is in order for consideration. It is of great importance. I think it is highly desirable that we act on it this evening, if at all possible.

I take this time to express the hope that we can proceed expeditiously with the consideration of the matter now before us, and then take up the deficiency bill and dispose of it yet this evening.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to have the distinguished majority leader take that position. An hour or two saved now will

mean a week saved in the session. We on this side are glad to cooperate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: On page 61, strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment,

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

CONSERVATION LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the items in this appropriation bill affecting the Soil Conservation Service. First of all, may I remind you that Government conservation programs did not originate with the late New Deal. No indeed. Our country's first real conservation efforts date back to another Roosevelt—namely Theodore Roosevelt.

May I also remind you that our present national soil and water conservation program did not originate with the late New Deal. No; it began in 1929, under a Republican administration, with the establishment of soil-conservation research stations on which the present important and expanding soil-conservation program is based. The Republican Party, gentlemen, has always stood for the conservation of our soil and water resources. Let us not forget that.

With that in mind, let me point out that the President, in his budget message for the fiscal year 1948, recommended an increase of only $137,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, the agency that is giving technical assistance to farmer-organized and farmer-controlled soil-conservation districts, which operate under State laws in all the 48 States. In the face of many new soil conservation districts the token increase which was recommended by the President over 1947 appropriation is entirely inadequate. The $5,000,000 which the present Bureau of the Budget reduced the Soil Conservation Service Department's request, in addition to the $5,000,000 reduction made by the committee for the fiscal year 1948, reduced the appropriation to $38,000,000 plus, is in my studied opinion considerable less than can be justified for this all-important work so vital to the continued prosperity of our Nation.

The administration would like farmers to get the idea the new Republican Congress is antisoil conservation. Bear in mind that the farmers of this country helped elect a Republican Congress. And do not forget for a minute that the farmerse who elect Republicans are the same farmers who have organized soil-conservation districts, and are organizing more of them every day—in Republican territory. Surely, it can mean only one thing: The farmers want the kind of assistance they get through soil-conservation districts and which requires only a fraction of the money we spent for some things the majority of our farmers do not want.

Now, I agree with one thing the President said in his budget message: That the national soil-conservation program should be carried out along the lines pursued by the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service, and that we should cut down on the AAA subsidy payments of the old triple A, which is now a branch of the Production and Marketing Administration. But the President did not back up his words with actions.

Let us not kid ourselves about this, gentlemen. The triple-A has been used politically in every election since 1933. On the other hand, the Soil Conservation Service has minded its own business and has stayed clear of partisan politics.

The President, in his budget message, said, and I quote, "More than 60 percent of the total AAA payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers." Most of this money thus is being paid to farmers who, because of their strong position in American agriculture, would undoubtedly continue the best farm-management practices without the persuasion of a bonus from their own United States Treasury, which is now in the red around $260,000,000,000.

We know the farmers want and need the kind of technical help they receive from the Soil Conservation Service through soil-conservation districts. If they did not why would they, on their own initiative, organize these districts and then ask the Soil Conservation Service for technical help? If they did not like this service and did not want it continued, why have they organized almost 200 new districts since June 15, 1946—districts that will suffer from the lack of technical help if we do not, early in the next session, appropriate additional funds to the Soil Conservation Service—the only agency that can give this assistance and for a moderate amount of funds.

Gentlemen, I have a proposal concerning the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service and for conservation subsidy payments that will enable us to let the American farmers know where we stand on sound, practical, permanent soil conservation. The President has tried to put this Congress on the spot with soil-conservation districts and with the farmers by recommending an increase of only $137,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, despite the increasing number of soil-conservation districts, and at the same time continued a $300,000,000 program for AAA.

I am deeply interested in the technical service the Soil Conservation Service is giving to soil-conservation districts which are being organized by farmers in both Republican and Democratic territory. Therefore, gentlemen, I propose in all seriousness—as an economy move that in the final analysis will help anybody in these entire United States—that a part of the amount we save in AAA payments in the future be added to the inadequate appropriation of the Soil Conservation Service so this hard-working, nonpolitical agency can give to the farmers of America the technical help they want and need in soil-conservation districts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

[Mr. CANNON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the practical considerations of the problem before us. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who preceded me, spoke very eloquently on behalf of health programs for children. That point, technically, is not involved. I do not believe there is anybody in this House who is opposed to school lunches as such. When the bill was first before us the problem was, from the standpoint of the children themselves, was it better for the money to be spent through a Federal agency or was it better for the money to be paid by the States and supervised by local people and local agencies? That point was decided. The House decided there should be a Federal program for school lunches. So that problem is not before us.

When the bill was before us before, another question raised was which agency of government, the Federal Government itself or the State government, is most able to pay. Many of us, myself included, argued, we thought very earnestly, that the States were in much better financial shape. My own State, the State of California, has a surplus of $450,000,000. I look over this room and there is not a Member in this room coming from a State which does not have a surplus today. The Federal Government today is $257,000,000,000 in the red. That suggestion did not prevail. This House has said that it shall be paid from State funds. So the problem before us now only divides itself into three parts.

First of all, what shall the amount be? What is the amount necessary? And that is a problem which I am going to try to show you can very easily be resolved.

Second, shall it be paid from the general funds of the Federal Government or shall it be paid from what is known as section 32 funds? I concur with the Senate in its belief that it should be paid from section 32 funds, although it is actually changing its nature as a program. It is no longer a surplus program, but a very broad nutritional program.

The third point is whether payments by the children for their own lunches shall be considered matching funds and credited to a State, to be matched by Federal funds.

These are the only three items before us, and they are very practical items. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will take no offense if I say something about what went on in the conference committee. The very time the conferees on each side decided to bring this item back in disagreement, I think the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Mis-

sissippi, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Washington, and the gentleman from Illinois, who are here, will all agree that the conferees were just about to come to a decision, to come to a compromise which, to my mind, would have been a very satisfactory compromise. The money that was spent last year in the program was not $75,000,000, as we are now asked to appropriate this year, but was $68,000,000. All of the money that was put up by the States was $11,500,000. To add in all other contributions you only get, as matching funds, $25,000,000. On top of that the Federal Government spent $10,000,000 for equipment. That is $35,000,000. So I was firmly convinced when we were in conference that we were going to come to a very amicable agreement at a figure which I think would be in the neighborhood of $60,000,000. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of the other conferees here, that is all that is needed for this program. As the gentleman from Washington pointed out, we are running ourselves into a very large program if we continue to enlarge this without State help and supervision. We are giving this program to a quarter of the eligible schools today; so multiply by four any figure you set up.

There is a discussion whether this should be paid from general funds because it is a nutritional program, or whether it should still be paid, as in the past, from section 32 funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I believe, and I believe the conferees as a whole believe, that this should be paid from section 32 funds.

The final question is whether we should continue taking the pennies of the school children, crediting them to a State, and then have the Federal Government match them, which to my mind is a double matching.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I am firmly convinced that this was on the point of amicable agreement and compromise. I therefore hope this House will vote down, will vote against the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, and will sustain the position of the House. That does not settle the matter. It will still have to go back to conference. I am firmly convinced it was just on the point of settlement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the basic legislation for a school-lunch program contemplate a gradual withdrawal from the field by the Federal Government in that we provide that in future years the States will be required to put up a substantial sum in addition to what they are putting up at the present time?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The difference is one of theory against practice; between those who believe it should be handled under the State governments, and those who believe it should be handled by the Federal Government. I have been familiar with this program for 12 years. If I had time I could tell you how it works in the different school districts, and I could show you how much better it is to have it under State and local supervision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, last year when we were considering a deficiency for the school-lunch program a statement was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] that I thought at that time was probably the most convincing statement on the subject. He stated that he was not willing, as much as he desired economy and reduction of expenditures, to do this at the expense of the children of America in their need for food.

I do not think we need to go into so many technicalities and questions as to how many dollars it will require when we come to deal with a matter of such extreme importance as that which has been demonstrated by experience in the school-lunch program throughout the United States. A few dollars or a few million dollars does not amount to much in comparison with the benefits to this Nation that the school-lunch program has afforded, will promise and certainly will be realized in the years that are to come. We did not appropriate enough and we had to come back and ask a deficiency appropriation to carry on this program for 2 months at a time when the schools were ready to stop and cut off the benefits that were received under this program because of lack of funds and when the schools had yet 2 months to run.

I am suggesting this to the House in the belief that we shall find, as the gentleman from Missouri has suggested, we are going to have a greater need for this program in years to come, the one immediately to come and following, because of the displacement of so many of the people and the necessity for providing this program for a greater number than have taken advantage of it heretofore. It is in its infancy, almost. We have learned from year to year, and we have the testimony no doubt of every school teacher in the land, that this is a magnificent program, that it has done more for the benefit of the children of this country in the schools than most anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washton [Mr. HORAN], a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want again to refresh the memory of the Members of the House of Representatives as to the implications and the potentialities in the action of your subcommittee in this matter. I resent the fact that some folks are inferring that we are taking bread away from starving children. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The fact remains that there are a little over 200,000 schools eligible for this program in the United States. There are a few more than 50,000 participating today.

In order to do justice to the job before the Appropriations Committee, it formulated a program by which it can appropriate with some intelligence, and we sought to do just that in our action. Our action lays this House eligible for almost $200,000,000 in school lunches based upon four times the $45,000,000 that we sought. I beg of you not to consider this in terms of the amount in the bill but in terms of the eventual potentiality in this and I want you to decline to call this economizing at the expense of our school children. Certainly our States are rolling in surpluses and it might be well, and they should be willing, because it is the children of their taxpayers, to participate up to the hilt in any program that the Federal Government is willing to supply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are going to make another great mistake here this afternoon. Most of us believe in economy but I believe there are very few Americans who believe in economizing when it comes to the health of our boys and girls. If you could have sat through the hearings when we had the school lunch program up, you would have heard Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States, and General Hershey, head of Selective Service, tell the tale of 50 percent of the boys of America, when called to the colors, being rejected. Why? Because of malnutrition during their youth. The great doctor and General Hershey said that in their opinion the school lunch program would do more to improve the health of our boys and girls than any other program that they knew of.

The program not only gives them food, but it teaches them nutrition. They carry that message back home. We find that there are thousands upon thousands of boys and girls in America, whose parents are in good circumstances, who have plenty of food, but because they do not know the kind of food that their bodies require are in just about as bad condition as the boys and girls of the poorer families.

This program has succeeded and it will continue to succeed if we will let it work. The States will participate to a greater extent each year in the program until the leveling off time comes.

[Mr. COOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, once more let me refresh the House on the parliamentary situation. The motion of the committee was to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment. The preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is to recede and concur. If we recede and concur, it simply

means that we strike out this language in the amount and also the limitation that the House placed on the school-lunch program. I therefore hope sincerely that the House will vote down the motion to recede and will stand by the committee and sustain the motion to insist.

There is a reason for that. The gentleman from California well put his finger on it. It looks as if we can obtain an agreement on the situation, and I am confident that with a minimum of difficulty we can probably contrive an agreeable compromise. That will be infinitely better. It will be agreeable to them and it must necessarily be agreeable to us; and we are not too hard-bitten about it. So I respectfully suggest that you let us take this back to the committee of conference, where I am confident that difficulty can be worked out.

The gentleman from Washington has put his finger on one thing that has appealed to me greatly, and that, of course, is the potentialities. If we are going to take the lid off finally, then let us make up our minds that in a few years under the impact of the forces that are operating at the present time this will go to $300,000,000, $350,000,000, or $400,000,000. As Dr. Ockey, who directs this program, said, if all the schools were in it would run to $350,000,000 or $400,000,000 a year. But there is something more than that. There is a movement on foot in the country at the present time to erase that so-called matching factor in the basic law and have the Federal Government sustain a larger share in this program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the basic legislation contemplate the Federal Government making even a smaller and smaller contribution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The basic legislation, yes, but they propose to get the basic legislation amended. That is the important thing.

Mr. COOLEY. That is a matter for the House to determine.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, and there will be the same pressure that we have been up against for a long time. You can write it down in the book that that gentleman from the American Federation of Labor who said before our committee that it probably ought to take $600,000,000 a year will not be very far from right. So I adjure you, then, to let us work this thing out in a patient way with the conferees of the Senate, and I am certain that it can be done.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina very briefly to the fact that when we started this program it was a surplus agricultural commodity program, and then it became a little bit wider and wider. The movement is not in the direction of which the gentleman from North Carolina speaks, unless we put some controls on it.



Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a cash program today, and there is no requirement even that abundant foods must be used. I saw the statement on a school in the State of Oregon or Washington the other day. The total sum was $1,200. That was the amount of the check that was sent as reimbursement to the school. If I remember the figures correctly, the abundant foods for a month totaled just about $45. It is a cash program. But notwithstanding that fact, we will work it out. That is not in issue. The House approved it and the Senate approved it, so the question is how much and under what conditions. So I suggest that the preferential motion be voted down and that the motion to insist on our disagreement to the Senate amendment be sustained.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. If certain Members of this body and Members of the other body continue to reject the reduction of taxes and insist on spending money in this way, just what is going to happen to the backbone of this Nation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have been appropriating millions upon millions of dollars for agriculture to help our farmers to raise abundant crops and still more crops. We have even appropriated money for fertilizer to help the farmers raise greater crops. Personally, I am of the opinion, as I said once before, that the most valuable crop we have in our country is our children, and we should not hesitate to appropriate at least a small portion of the amount that we have appropriated for agriculture year in and year out.

I have voted for millions of dollars to help agriculture, so I appeal to you, in view of the ever-increasing cost of milk and other things that are needed by our children, to vote in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I feel it is in the right direction. We can well afford to appropriate these few additional millions for such a noble and deserving cause.

The constantly increasing prices of milk, butter, eggs, and every other item that goes into this worth-while program for better health make this small additional appropriation absolutely necessary, and I hope that, without regard to politics, Members who have the interest of our children at heart and who believe they are entitled to a diet which will guard them against illness and malnutrition, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] pointed out, will support this amendment, which adds only 3 or 4 percent of what we have appropriated for agricultural use.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be agreed to We should keep in mind the fact that in the last Congress this school-lunch program was given sanction—a program of aid was written into that measure. During the first year the States matched Federal aid dollar for dollar, during the second year State participation is increased to one and a half dollars, and the third year and thereafter the States put up $2 for each dollar put into the program by the Federal Government. Plans have been made by the States based upon a $75,000,000 appropriation.

This is not a gift. It is a marvelous investment. What could be of greater benefit to the Nation than an assurance of at least one hot meal for every school child in the Nation. I think it is a great program—Congress has made a decision to that effect. Let us not stint the program. In the interest of the health of our children, let us agree to the motion and appropriate an additional $30,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and other gentlemen have very well expressed the need for a nutritional program for the great bulk of our children in the public schools. It is possible to have undernourishment and an abundance of certain kinds of food at the same time. It is scientifically true that children may be undergoing a degree of starvation even on the American farms where tables are groaning with good things to eat—but which is not in all respects the right kind of food. But I do not wish to discuss that, for it requires scientific knowledge that I do not possess.

It occurs to me that the arguments of the gentlemen on the committee and among the House conferees have overlooked some tragic facts concerning so many American families today. By their words some of them have implied that the average American family is well enough off to furnish the children of that family all their food requirement. Such may be true of many, many American families, and for that fact we are thankful—but the opposite is also true. There are many thousands of American families unable to provide at home sufficient nourishing food for the children of those families. And that is especially true of our displaced families, for let it be understood that there are displaced persons in the United States just as there are displaced persons in Europe. This is true not quite for the same reasons, but perhaps to a greater extent than in Europe.

Surely we all recall the tragic circumstances that set so many families on the road a decade ago, seeking new work opportunities and homes in the West. Some of these were victims of unfriendly nature in the Dust Bowl. Others were victims of economic changes in American farm life. But we know that in the last preceding decade hundreds of thousands clogged our highways, moving West. Undoubtedly all of us have heard of the Grapes of Wrath, and some of us have seen the poverty-stricken humanity covered by that term. In the Pacific

Southwest hundreds of thousands of families sought to take root and establish themselves in the decade of the thirties, and to the children of such families hot school lunches were a salvation.

We thought that the type of persons covered by the expression Grapes of Wrath were ceasing to be prominent on the American scene, and now we hear the term used again with a slightly different connotation. Today there are poverty-stricken families, not of migratory farm labor, but of migratory war workers. They linger on in the communities where they made perhaps good wages in war work a few years ago, but their savings have vanished and the schools in many communities are crowded with the children of these families who have not been in their present location a half-dozen years. It is the children of these families to which the hot school lunches should be supplied and would be as helpful as they were a few years ago when furnished to the migratory farm families. Gentlemen, this problem is increasing rather than decreasing, and we must not blind ourselves to that fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if it is necessary for me as a member of this subcommitteee to say to the Members of the House that this Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture is back of its chairman 100 percent. No man on that committee is opposed to the school-lunch program as such. Every man on that committee goes with the chairman if we are sent back to conference with the idea of making a fair compromise to carry out the wishes of the House to save wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money so apparent as made by the testimony before our committee. Those who need the money least have profited at the expense of those who can least afford to pay—country-wide. To accept the Senator's figures is to encourage the profligate spending of money for a class which should pay the lunch bills of its own children.

A reasonable expenditure, federally, plus State cooperation, plus a reasonable sense of personal responsibility, will solve a problem which should not become an annual billion-dollar burden on those least able to bear it. We can reach a fair compromise if we are given that opportunity and carry on the program as it should be operated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 195, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—181

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Flannagan | Mills |
| Albert | Fogarty | Monroney |
| Allen, La. | Folger | Morgan |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Forand | Morris |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gary | Morrison |
| Angell | Gathings | Murdock |
| Bakewell | Gordon | Murray, Tenn. |
| Barden | Gore | Murray, Wis. |
| Bates, Ky. | Gorski | Norton |
| Battle | Granger | O'Brien |
| Beckworth | Grant, Ala. | O'Konski |
| Blatnik | Gregory | O'Toole |
| Boggs, La. | Hagen | Pace |
| Bolton | Harless, Ariz. | Passman |
| Boykin | Harris | Peden |
| Brehm | Harrison | Peterson |
| Brooks | Hart | Philbin |
| Brophy | Havenner | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Brown, Ga. | Hedrick | Pickett |
| Bryson | Hendricks | Poage |
| Buchanan | Hobbs | Potts |
| Bulwinkle | Hoeven | Poulson |
| Burleson | Holifield | Preston |
| Busbey | Huber | Price, Fla. |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Hull | Price, Ill. |
| Camp | Jackson, Wash. | Priest |
| Cannon | Jarman | Rabin |
| Carroll | Javits | Rains |
| Chelf | Johnson, Okla. | Rankin |
| Clark | Jones, Ala. | Rayburn |
| Combs | Jones, N. C. | Rayfiel |
| Cooley | Karsten, Mo. | Redden |
| Cooper | Kearney | Richards |
| Corbett | Kefauver | Rogers, Fla. |
| Courtney | Kennedy | Rohrbough |
| Cox | Kersten, Wis. | Rooney |
| Cravens | Kilday | Sabath |
| Crosser | King | Sadowski |
| Cunningham | Lane | Sasscer |
| Davis, Ga. | Lanham | Sikes |
| Davis, Tenn. | Larcade | Smathers |
| Davis, Wis. | LeCompte | Snyder |
| Dawson, Ill. | Lemke | Somers |
| Deane | Lesinski | Spence |
| Delaney | Lewis | Stevenson |
| Dolliver | Lusk | Stigler |
| Domengeaux | Lyle | Talle |
| Donohue | Lynch | Teague |
| Dorn | McCormack | Thomas, Tex. |
| Doughton | McDonough | Trimble |
| Douglas | McMillan, S. C. | Welch |
| Drewry | Madden | Wheeler |
| Durham | Mahon | Whitten |
| Eberharter | Manasco | Whittington |
| Elliott | Mansfield, | Williams |
| Engle, Calif. | Marcantonio | Winstead |
| Evins | Martin, Iowa | Wolverton |
| Fallon | Meade, Ky. | Wood |
| Feighan | Meade, Md. | Worley |
| Fernandez | Merrow | Zimmerman |
| | Miller, Calif. | |

NAYS—195

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Carson | Fellows |
| Allen, Ill. | Case, N. J. | Fenton |
| Almond | Case, S. Dak. | Fisher |
| Anderson, Calif. | Chadwick | Fletcher |
| Andresen, August H. | Chenoweth | Foote |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Chiperfield | Gamble |
| Arends | Church | Gavin |
| Arnold | Clason | Gillette |
| Auchincloss | Clevenger | Gillie |
| Banta | Clippinger | Goff |
| Barrett | Coffin | Goodwin |
| Bates, Mass. | Cole, Kans. | Gossett |
| Beall | Cole, N. Y. | Graham |
| Bell | Cotton | Grant, Ind. |
| Bender | Coudert | Griffiths |
| Bennett, Mo. | Crawford | Gross |
| Bishop | Crow | Gwinn, N. Y. |
| Blackney | Curtis | Hale |
| Boggs, Del. | Dague | Hall, Leonard W. |
| Bradley | Dawson, Utah | Halleck |
| Bramblett | Devitt | Hand |
| Brown, Ohio | D'Ewart | Harness, Ind. |
| Buck | Dirksen | Herter |
| Buffett | Dondero | Heselton |
| Burke | Ellis | Hess |
| Butler | Ellsworth | Hill |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Elsaesser | Hinshaw |
| Canfield | Elston | Hoffman |
| | Engel, Mich. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Holmes | Maloney | Schwabe, Mo. |
| Hope | Mathews | Schwabe, Okla. |
| Horan | Meyer | Scoblick |
| Jackson, Calif. | Michener | Scott, Hardie |
| Jenison | Miller, Conn. | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Jenkins, Ohio | Miller, Md. | Scrivner |
| Jenkins, Pa. | Miller, Nebr. | Seely-Brown |
| Jennings | Mitchell | Shafer |
| Jensen | Morton | Simpson, Ill. |
| Johnson, Calif. | Muhlenberg | Simpson, Pa. |
| Johnson, Ill. | Mundt | Smith, Kans. |
| Johnson, Ind. | Nixon | Smith, Maine |
| Jones, Ohio | Nodar | Smith, Wis. |
| Jonkman | Norblad | Springer |
| Judd | O'Hara | Stanley |
| Kean | Owens | Stefan |
| Kearns | Phillips, Calif. | Stockman |
| Keating | Ploeser | Taber |
| Keefe | Plumley | Taylor |
| Kilburn | Ramey | Thomas, N. J. |
| Knutson | Reed, Ill. | Tibbott |
| Kunkel | Reed, N. Y. | Tollefson |
| Landis | Rees | Towe |
| Latham | Reeves | Twyman |
| LeFevre | Rich | Vail |
| Lodge | Riehlman | Van Zandt |
| Love | Rizley | Vorys |
| Lucas | Robertson | Vursell |
| McConnell | Robsion | Wadsworth |
| McDowell | Rockwell | Weichel |
| McGarvey | Rogers, Mass. | Wigglesworth |
| McGregor | Ross | Wilson, Ind. |
| McMahon | Russell | Wilson, Tex. |
| McMillen, Ill. | Sadlak | Wolcott |
| Mack | St. George | Woodruff |
| MacKinnon | Sanborn | Youngblood |
| Macy | Sarbacher | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patterson

NOT VOTING—53

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett, Mich. | Hall, Edwin Arthur | McCowen |
| Bland | Hardy | Mason |
| Bloom | Hartley | Norrell |
| Bonner | Hays | Patman |
| Buckley | Hébert | Pfeifer |
| Celler | Heffernan | Powell |
| Chapman | Howell | Riley |
| Clements | Johnson, Tex. | Rivers |
| Cole, Mo. | Jones, Wash. | Sheppard |
| Colmer | Kee | Short |
| Dingell | Kelley | Smith, Ohio |
| Eaton | Keogh | Smith, Va. |
| Fuller | Kerr | Stratton |
| Fulton | Kirwan | Sundstrom |
| Gallagher | Klein | Thomason |
| Gearhart | Lea | Vinson |
| Gifford | Ludlow | Walter |
| Gwynne, Iowa | | West |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Howell against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Short with Mr. Keogh
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. ARNOLD, Mr. BANTA, Mr. MICHENER, Mr. RAMEY, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, and Mr. KEARNS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PICKETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GIFFORD. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted

"yea." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote just taken, I ask unanimous consent that we consider amendment No. 59, which is related thereto. It should have been considered in connection with the other amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 59: Page 81, line 12, insert:

"To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 59.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the only other controversial amendment is the one relating to farm-tenant loans, which comes next. I trust we can hold down the discussion and dispose of it very quickly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 50: Page 67, line 1, strike out "For loans under" and insert "Title I and section 43, $20,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the farmers of America should not be treated on a partisan basis in the Congress of the United States. It is impossible for us to keep some partisanship from creeping in, but I believe that this is an amendment in which we should have a minimum of partisan consideration. After all, this will be more or less removed from partisan consideration because it is almost 100 percent a matter of undertaking to help the veterans of this country who yearn for the land, to get a foothold on the land.

It is called a farm-tenant-program amendment, but basically it is for the veterans who are seeking to acquire farm homes. Local committees work with these veterans in selecting the farms and undertaking to see to it that the veteran gets value received. I know of many cases where veterans have been disappointed because those committees who look after this program have not been willing to approve certain high-priced farm purchases.

The object of this program is to enable the veteran to purchase the land upon a long-time income basis, upon such a basis that he may be reasonably assured of paying for it in the future. The farm-tenant program has been very successful. This is not a grant, this is not money out of the Treasury that will not be returned, this is simply saying that at a time when we are giving away millions of dollars overseas to help others, some of whom fought against out veterans in many cases, that we will give the veteran a chance to borrow money from his Government under a program that has been financially sound in the past and undoubtedly will be sound in the future, because it is well supervised by one of the best administrators in the Government.

I have the Senate hearings here, and as I looked through them I noticed where the Farm Bureau spoke in behalf of this $20,000,000 for veteran loans for farm homes. I looked further and found that the Grange said that it was strongly in favor of the continuation of this program. To go in and out of a long-term loan program, to go out in good times, and to go in in bad times does not make sense. You cannot close up a bank today, open it tomorrow, close it next week, and open it the following week. To have a business of this kind operate successfully it has to be a continuing program.

This item will not enable a large number of people to get loans and buy farms, but it will help a few. It means, Mr. Speaker, that he will not just slam the door and say: "No loans, no homes for veterans on the farms under this program." Loan applications are coming in at the rate of 3,000 a month. There are about 40,000 veteran applications pending, so I am told. That is the reason I say I hope this program will be continued.

When I looked to see what the Farm Bureau said and what the Grange said about the program I also looked to see what the veterans said. The veterans came before the committee and advocated continuation of the farm-tenant purchase program. A spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars told the committee, "We want this program continued." With reference to present high land prices, the spokesman for the VFW said:

Our organization, Senator, incidentally, is wholeheartedly in agreement with your belief that now is the time to carefully watch every purchase.

Certainly we do not want to have saddled upon the veteran a farm which he cannot pay for. He is not going to have such an arrangement saddled upon him because the program is well administered and it is admitted by all that care must be used. So I think we should go along with all the farm organizations and all the veterans' organizations and all the other such organizations in continuing this program in a modest way. Later it must be greatly expanded.

The President asked for only $35,000,000. The bill now provides only $20,000,000. It is not much, but it keeps the door open. I urge the House to continue the farm-tenant purchase program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the House committee originally considered this bill it provided ample funds for the continuation of purchases under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act. Ten days after we had completed those hearings the committee was called back into session and these funds were stricken out. The Senate has restored $20,000,000 of those funds.

In considering this amendment I want to point out one or two things that I think merit your attention. Many say that the veteran should avail himself of the loan provisions of the GI bill. That may have been true at one time but we recently saw in the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act that that bank was prohibited from underwriting loans for the purchase of veterans' farms. You are going to see now that your local banks will not approve purchases under the GI bill since the RFC will not accept their paper and cannot under the present law. It will leave the veteran where he has no place to turn for the purpose of borrowing money to purchase a farm.

You are going to hear, when the distinguished chairman of the committee speaks to you, that the President came out and said that the prices are inflated and now is no time to buy land. Granted that land values are inflated, the law protects the veteran because the Farmers Home Administration cannot approve a loan for a farm at any value greater than the normal value, based upon the income for a reasonable period of years. You may say, "Well, they will not be able to buy many farms under this program." That is perhaps true, but it is really the desire of each Member of Congress—I think it is not only your desire but is your duty—to provide these funds so that the veterans may have some place to obtain a loan so that they may become self-supporting and own a farm home on a workable basis. After all, the recent GI bill will not work any longer so far as veterans purchasing a farm is concerned because this Congress changed the law with reference to the RFC not less than 2 weeks ago. You said that the RFC cannot underwrite a GI loan for that purchase, and having done that, since the law protects the veteran and will not permit him to buy a farm at more than it is worth, by all means this Congress, both Republicans and Democrats alike, should now provide these funds so that in those cases where the land can be found the veteran may be enabled to buy and own a farm.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time at my disposal, it will not be possible for me to discuss fully the merits of the tenant-purchase program of the Farmers Home Administration, I frankly believe that every Member of this House realizes that the Tenant Purchase Program is by far the best part of the Farmers Home Administration and that it was for many years the best part of the Farm Security Administration. While I realize that the hour is late and that the House is anxious to take final action on the matter now before us, I do not believe that we should be in such a great hurry that we fail to appreciate the importance of this particular matter. Certainly this is one of the most important appropriations which this Congress will make, insofar as appropriations will affect the welfare, happiness, and security of the humble tenant farmers of the country who desire to purchase and to own a farm home. It is also important to veterans who are anxious to acquire farms and to establish their homes in the country. The one outstanding virtue of the tenant-purchase program is that it provided, for the first time, an opportunity for an humble tenant farmer to enjoy the pride of ownership. Under this particular program thousands of citizens have been given an opportunity to start on the road to home ownership. But for this very worth-while program, many of these good citizens would have in all probability remained tenants for the rest of their natural lives. This is one program that speaks for itself. In every agricultural county in America you will find happy farmers living on their own farms, farms which they were able to purchase and to own because of the aid and assistance made possible by acts of Congress in which all of us take great pride. This is not a subsidy to the underprivileged; this is not a gift of Federal funds; it is a sound investment—an investment made upon normal land values and to individuals worthy of the credit of their Government. Even the opponents of the appropriations, which we seek in behalf of the tenant-purchase program, must confess that the program has been properly administered and that the collection record has been excellent and has far exceeded all expectations.

The effect of the action of our honorable committee in holding out against providing funds for the tenant-purchase program is to completely and utterly destroy the program and to deprive the humble tenant farmers of America of an opportunity to become home owners.

I want to remind the House of the fact that the subcommittee, headed by the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Illinois, first took favorable action upon this particular appropriation and recommended that the sum of $25,000,000 be appropriated for the tenant-purchase program. After the committee had filed its report the committee was advised by press reports that the President had requested the Secretary of Agriculture to call a conference of the officials of private lending agencies for the purpose of discussing inflation in land values. The committee, taking this as its cue, again went into a huddle and struck out the $25,000,000 and attempted to justify its action by the statement that they were attempting to strengthen the President's arm in an effort to control inflation in farm land values. Gov. Ivy Duggan, of the Farm Credit Administration, is directly responsible for all of this. But for the fact that Mr. Ruggan suggested to the President that he request the Secretary to call the conference, $25,000,000 would certainly have been provided for the tenant-purchase program. You will perhaps recall that when this matter was before the House some time ago, I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture which clearly indicated that neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor the President intended in any way to reflect upon the tenant-purchase program or to suggest that it should be curtailed below the budget recommendation of $35,000,000. But the damage had been done.

If the conference was of such great importance, it certainly appears that Congress should have been advised concerning the results of the deliberations of those who assembled in Washington for the purpose of discussing the important subject of inflation in land values. Does any Member of this House know anything at all about the conclusions of those who conferred? The conference was called in Washington and I understand was attended by approximately 100 officials of private lending agencies such as insurance companies and banking institutions. While I do not know much about the conference and know absolutely nothing about the conclusions reached, I do know one thing that happened at this great national conference which was considered of such great importance. At the very first meeting of the conference, according to press reports, the officials of private lending agencies who had been invited here to attend the conference took Governor Duggan to task. They knew about his inconsistent position with regard to loans to farmers. They knew that while he was urging private lending agencies to be more cautious in making loans upon farm lands and urging private companies to bear down on farm loans, he was at the same time appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture urging that committee to favorably report legislation which would authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make more liberal loans to farmers at the same time and in the same market. Apparently when the conference became a little to hot for Duggan, he asked that the doors be closed. So far as I know, the doors were closed. The press was directed to leave the conference and to this good day not a Member of this House knows what resulted in the dugout behind the closed doors with Duggan and the conferees. Nothing has appeared in the press, nor have we heard over the radio about the achievements of this great national conference on inflated land values. The sad fact remains, however, that the calling of the conference resulted in the striking out of all appropriations for the farm tenant purchase program. This is not just fiction; it is a fact based upon the printed report filed by the subcommittee.

Even though the conference ended in failure, the effect of it has been devastating to the hopes and ambitions of the thousands of young men who are anxious to purchase and to own a farm home in this country of ours. I am pleading with you Republicans and Democrats alike to save this program. If this subcommittee has its way, the program will be permanently destroyed. Even if we end up with only twelve or fifteen million dollars and earmark every part of it for returning veterans, it will certainly be better than writing the entire program off the books at this time. My recollection is that in excess of 49,000 veterans back in your district and in mine have applied for loans and are anxious for the aid which this appropriation will make available. I hope, therefore, that the House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment which will assure a continuation of the program which after all is but a modest effort to solve a great problem—the problem of farm tenancy, which has for so long been a curse upon American agriculture. Even if we provided 10 times $20,000,000 for this worthy purpose, I would still say that it is a sound investment—an investment which will pay great dividends in the days to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious proposal. I realize that $20,000,000 would not buy one farm per county in the United States. I realize that over all these years if we are really going to make any progress, we must have more adequate funds in order to solve the problem that is to be solved. In the past we have had probably 10 percent of these loans in one State and 40 percent in three States. The time has come, I think, when we ought to have a better distribution of the loans that are made, and I just hope that we can continue this type of loan until a broader approach to the problem is possible. It is hoped the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will pass legislation like the Cunningham bill with sufficient funds to go ahead and really give the people that fought this war a little piece of America that they are entitled to obtain. I shall vote for this amendment in the hopes that much-needed legislation will be passed to implement this meager appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this money is not for a gift; it is not for a subsidy. It is for interest-bearing loans to give to tenant farmers an opportunity to begin to make himself a part of this Nation and to anchor on a farm. It is not the home owners or the farm owners of this country that bring about the emergencies and cause the trouble. It is the floating population, and every time you can make a man the owner of a

home or a farmer the owner of a farm, he is thereby becoming a stockholder in his Government and is a substantial citizen, and with that class of folks we have a minimum amount of trouble. Let us continue to help those who want to help themselves. I think it is sound economy and a good insurance policy for our form of government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to make sure that the Members correctly appraise the parliamentary situation. The committee has moved that we insist upon our disagreement to the Senate amendment. A preferential motion has been made to recede and concur, so the vote will come on the preferential motion, and I trust the preferential motion to recede and concur will be voted down.

Now, the question here is not whether there is going to be some money for farm tenant purchase loans or no money, because I think the conferees are pretty well agreed that they are going to get some funds for this. It is just a question of how much. If we take this back to conference I am very confident, of course, that we can contrive a very good solution. But, when the proposition was made to the House conferees and they said, "It is that or nothing," we had no choice except to bring it back. But I am confident if we go back to conference on this matter, I will say to you gentlemen who have belabored this matter there will be some money for farm tenant purchase loans. I do not pretend to say how much it will be, but we are going to be just as decent about it as we can.

I want to take a minute to speak on something I think everybody in this House ought to be interested in. You hear these great generalities here about veterans' loans, and that if you do not provide this money there will be no loans for veterans. This is a quotable figure, and I think you will want it sometime this summer. Here are the figures from the Veterans' Administration itself with respect to the farm loans closed. These figures came up only 2 or 3 days ago. In the fiscal year that ended on the 30th of June 1947, the Veterans' Administration made 24,521 farm loans. How many loans did the Farmers Home Corporation make? They made only 3,700 loans. Let me express it to you in a form so that you can best understand just what that means. The tenant purchase loans in 1946—and this is Mr. Lasseter's testimony before the Senate committee—were 3,657. Then Senator BROOKS said, "Why, Mr. Lasseter, that is an average of about one loan for each county in the United States for 1 year to a veteran." One veteran farm loan in a county in a whole year. That was the program when they had infinitely more money than we were willing to let them have at the present time.

If you want to find out how this thing scores up, take your home county and multiply by seven. In the case of a county of 30,000 people there will be 2,100 veterans. That is a pretty good rule of thumb to find out how many veterans of World War II served from your county. So that would be 2,100 veterans in a county of 30,000 people. Those 2,100 veterans on the average could get one farm loan under the money they had for 1946. There should not be so much generality about this matter. Certainly we are interested in veterans' loans, but we are interested in making certain that we meet this land fever and this speculative boom that is in the air right now. On the 9th of June the Secretary of Agriculture made a statement in a land conference, and the title of his speech was "Land Fever." He showed how deeply in debt they were going, so that if they buy a farm today and put a mortgage on it that mortgage is going to be equal to the 1941 value of the whole farm. Do you think the Federal Government ought to go in with a lot of money or hold it on the conservative side and be reasonably selective until this fever dissipates itself a little bit?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want the gentleman to know that all of the loans made under the GI bill were prior to the change in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. We have no figures as to whether any loans have been made under the GI bill since the RFC Act was changed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, nor did we have any argument that they are not being made in banks, that was made before. There has been no testimony to that point.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Did not the President himself warn against the danger of this speculative boom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was the purpose in calling a conference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know anything at all about the conclusions reached at that conference?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do know this, I know the conclusions that were reached by the Secretary of Agriculture, under whose direction this program is being administered, and that is the important thing.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Secretary of Agriculture wrote me a letter, which I placed in the RECORD, indicating that he did not desire this program impaired?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know what the Secretary of Agriculture said in the 10-page speech that is right here on the committee desk. I am willing to stand by that.

I trust that the preferential motion will be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. COOLEY demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 193, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—172

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Forand | Morrison |
| Albert | Gary | Muhlenberg |
| Allen, La. | Gathings | Mundt |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gordon | Murdock |
| Angell | Gore | Murray, Tenn. |
| Barden | Gorski | Murray, Wis. |
| Bates, Ky. | Gossett | O'Brien |
| Battle | Granger | O'Konski |
| Beckworth | Grant, Ala. | O'Toole |
| Bennett, Mo. | Gregory | Pace |
| Blatnik | Hagen | Passman |
| Bloom | Hand | Peden |
| Boykin | Harless, Ariz. | Peterson |
| Brehm | Harris | Philbin |
| Brooks | Harrison | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Brown, Ga. | Havenner | Pickett |
| Bryson | Hedrick | Poage |
| Buchanan | Hendricks | Poulson |
| Bulwinkle | Hobbs | Preston |
| Burleson | Holifield | Price, Fla. |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Huber | Price, Ill. |
| Camp | Hull | Priest |
| Cannon | Jackson, Wash. | Rains |
| Carroll | Jarman | Rankin |
| Chelf | Johnson, Okla. | Rayburn |
| Clark | Jones, Ala. | Redden |
| Colmer | Jones, N. C. | Richards |
| Combs | Karsten, Mo. | Rizley |
| Cooley | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Cooper | Kennedy | Rogers, Fla. |
| Corbett | Kerr | Rogers, Mass. |
| Courtney | Kilday | Rohrbough |
| Cox | King | Rooney |
| Cravens | Lane | Sadowski |
| Crosser | Lanham | Sasscer |
| Cunningham | Larcade | Schwabe, Mo. |
| Davis, Ga. | Lea | Sikes |
| Davis, Tenn. | LeCompte | Smathers |
| Deane | Lemke | Somers |
| Delaney | Lesinski | Spence |
| Domengeaux | Lucas | Stevenson |
| Donohue | Lusk | Stigler |
| Dorn | Lyle | Teague |
| Doughton | McCormack | Thomas, Tex. |
| Douglas | McMillan, S. C. | Trimble |
| Drewry | Madden | Van Zandt |
| Durham | Mahon | Wheeler |
| Eberharter | Manasco | Whitten |
| Elliott | Mansfield | Whittington |
| Engle, Calif. | Marcantonio | Williams |
| Evins | Martin, Iowa | Wilson, Tex. |
| Fallon | Meade, Ky. | Winstead |
| Feighan | Meade, Md. | Wolverton |
| Fernandez | Miller, Calif. | Wood |
| Fisher | Mills | Worley |
| Flannagan | Monroney | Zimmerman |
| Fogarty | Morgan | |
| Folger | Morris | |

NAYS—193

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Case, N. J. | Gamble |
| Allen, Ill. | Case, S. Dak. | Gavin |
| Almond | Chadwick | Gearhart |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Chenoweth | Gillette |
| Anderson, Calif. | Chiperfield | Gillie |
| Andresen, August H. | Church | Goff |
| Arends | Clason | Goodwin |
| Arnold | Clevenger | Graham |
| Auchincloss | Clippinger | Grant, Ind. |
| Bakewell | Coffin | Griffiths |
| Banta | Cole, Kans. | Gross |
| Barrett | Cole, N. Y. | Gwinn, N. Y. |
| Bates, Mass. | Cotton | Hale |
| Beall | Coudert | Hall, Leonard W. |
| Bender | Crawford | Halleck |
| Bishop | Crow | Harness, Ind. |
| Blackney | Curtis | Herter |
| Boggs, Del. | Dague | Heselton |
| Bolton | Davis, Wis. | Hess |
| Bradley | Dawson, Utah | Hill |
| Bramblett | Devitt | Hinshaw |
| Brophy | Dirksen | Hoeven |
| Brown, Ohio | Dolliver | Hoffman |
| Buck | Dondero | Holmes |
| Buffett | Ellis | Hope |
| Burke | Ellsworth | Horan |
| Busbey | Elsaesser | Jackson, Calif. |
| Butler | Elston | Jenison |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Engel, Mich. | Jenkins, Ohio |
| Canfield | Fellows | Jenkins, Pa. |
| Carson | Fenton | Jennings |
| | Fletcher | Jensen |
| | Foote | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Johnson, Calif. | Michener | Scrivner |
| Johnson, Ill. | Miller, Md. | Seely-Brown |
| Johnson, Ind. | Miller, Nebr. | Shafer |
| Jonkman | Mitchell | Simpson, Ill. |
| Judd | Morton | Simpson, Pa. |
| Kean | Nixon | Smith, Kans. |
| Kearney | Nodar | Smith, Maine |
| Kearns | O'Hara | Smith, Wis. |
| Keating | Owens | Snyder |
| Keefe | Patterson | Springer |
| Kersten, Wis. | Phillips, Calif. | Stanley |
| Kilburn | Ploeser | Stefan |
| Knutson | Plumley | Stockman |
| Kunkel | Potts | Taber |
| Landis | Ramey | Talle |
| Latham | Reed, Ill. | Taylor |
| LeFevre | Reed, N. Y. | Thomas, N. J. |
| Lewis | Rees | Tibbott |
| Lodge | Reeves | Tollefson |
| Love | Riehlman | Towe |
| McConnell | Robsion | Twyman |
| McDonough | Rockwell | Vail |
| McDowell | Ross | Vorys |
| McGarvey | Russell | Vursell |
| McGregor | Sadlak | Wadsworth |
| McMahon | St. George | Weichel |
| McMillen, Ill. | Sanborn | Wigglesworth |
| Mack | Sarbacher | Wilson, Ind. |
| MacKinnon | Schwabe, Okla. | Wolcott |
| Macy | Scoblick | Woodruff |
| Maloney | Scott, Hardie | Youngblood |
| Mathews | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. | |
| Merrow | | |
| Meyer | | |

NOT VOTING—65

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andrews, N. Y. | Hardy | Norrell |
| Bell | Hart | Norton |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hartley | Patman |
| Bland | Hays | Pfeifer |
| Boggs, La. | Hébert | Powell |
| Bonner | Heffernan | Rabin |
| Buckley | Howell | Rayfiel |
| Celler | Javits | Rich |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Riley |
| Clements | Jones, Ohio | Rivers |
| Cole, Mo. | Jones, Wash. | Sabath |
| Dawson, Ill. | Kee | Sheppard |
| D'Ewart | Kelley | Short |
| Dingell | Keogh | Smith, Ohio |
| Eaton | Kirwan | Smith, Va. |
| Fuller | Klein | Stratton |
| Fulton | Ludlow | Sundstrom |
| Gallagher | Lynch | Thomason |
| Gifford | McCowen | Vinson |
| Gwynne, Iowa | Mason | Walter |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Miller, Conn. | Welch |
| | Norblad | West |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Clements.
M. D'Ewart with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Miller of Connecticut with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Jones of Ohio with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Short with Mr. Rabin.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Powell.

Mr. BREHM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 78, line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525)."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this matter is not in controversy. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in expending the appropriation herein for 'Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry,' service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: On page 80, line 11, after "flax", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed 633 counties and flax in not to exceed 87 counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed 50 counties each and cotton in not to exceed 56 counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this matter is not in controversy, but it had to be brought back, the matter being legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 1 in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 4, line 4, strike out "$3,186,000" and insert "$3,486,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 17 in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 24, line 4, strike out "$1,059,000" and insert "$1,061,840."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICAN DOLLARS FOR EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we are again in another world crisis. The events of today are not unlike those of 1939 and 1940 which took us into World War II. To me the pattern is identical. At great sacrifice in men, money, and material the people of this country brought victory on the sea, in the air, and on the land. We had a right to believe that this victory would bring a just and lasting peace and with it a respite from further sacrifice. As always our young men brought us a military victory; as usual the diplomats who sit around the tables to write the peace have failed. We know today, Mr. Speaker, that the men who represented our country at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam failed miserably, with the result that the world is in a sorry plight. The London Conference, the Paris Conference, the Moscow Conference all have ended in failure—our diplomats have failed again. And in these failures is the obvious fact that our people must continue to sacrifice in money and property in the cause of world stability.

A few weeks ago Secretary Marshall, in an address at Harvard University, suggested that if the European world was ever to recover a measure of economic self-sufficiency there must be agreement between the countries as to their requirements. Great Britain and France snapped at that suggestion as a muskie grabs a hook in a northern Wisconsin lake. Thus, from Mr. Marshall's statement there bloomed the now historical Marshall plan. Just what it is nobody seems to know but the casual statement was sufficient to provoke a meeting in Paris. What happened there has split the world in two and has precipitated this country into another world crisis. Our people are confused and so is the Congress of the United States. We are presently in the middle of an economic war with Russia, with the shooting war only a few years away unless the so-called Western World can resolve its difficulties with the east. The chips are down; what shall we do?

Mr. Speaker, no individual and no political party has the right to withhold information from the public which involves its life or property. It is evident today that the State Department does not

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 22, 1947
For actions of July 21, 1947
80th-1st, No. 140

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed)..... 1
Appropriations.....1,10,11,12,54,58
Bankruptcy.....46
Committees..... 5
Crop insurance.....55
Dairy industry.....20
Drainage.....27
Farm program..... 8
Fats and oils.....31
Flood control.....32
Foreign affairs..25,29,42,51
Forests & forestry..15,24,50,57
Economic report.....61
Housing..... 7
Labor.....52
Lands.....13,21,28,38
Lands, grazing.....4,23
Lands, reclamation..... 26
Latin America.....29,42
Law, revision..... 6
Livestock and meat.....19
Loans, farm.....30,45,60
Marketing.....16,47
Minerals.....24,39
Patents.....44
Peanuts.....17
Personnel.....3,5,9,22,35
Prices, control.....41
Plant quarantine.....59
Prices, support.....20
Property, surplus..32,34,56
Purchasing.....25
Remount service..... 2
Research.....14,18,40
Rubber.....42
Social security.....43
Small business.....33,53
Soil conservation....49,60
Statistics.....31,36
Subsidies.....19
Territories and possessions.....28,50,60
Transportation.....37
Veterans' benefits..3,28,35,45
Wildlife.....34

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on agricultural appropriation bill and acted on amendments. Both Houses received mid-year economic report from President. House passed bills to revise Civil Service Retirement Act, amend Marketing Agreement Act, provide for fats and oils statistics, change peanut-quota provisions, transfer Crab Orchard project, provide for specific milk-price supports, extend certain farm programs to Virgin Islands, control importation of nursery stock, modify Research and marketing Act provisions regarding appropriations. House agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill. House received conference report on National Science Foundation.

## SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 9645-7). Agreed to the House amendment, regarding BAI quarantine service, to the Senate amendment concerning leave payments (p. 9647). Further insisted on Senate amendments as follows:
   - Meat-inspection increase and deletion of reimbursable provision (p. 9647).
   - Agricultural conservation program increases (pp. 9647-63, 9671-3, 9676-8); by an 81-0 vote.
   - School-lunch program increase (pp. 9678-9); by an 81-0 vote.
   - Farm-tenant loans item (pp. 9679-80); by an 84-0 vote.

   Sens. Brooks, Gurney, Reed, Bushfield, Russell, Hayden, and Tydings were appointed conferees for a further conference (p. 9680).

2. REMOUNT SERVICE. Sen. Thomas, Okla., criticized H. R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service to the Department, and spoke in favor of S. 718, to provide for sale of the Fort Reno station to farmers. Sen. Morse spoke in favor of H. R. 3484 and inserted the report of the Department on this bill. Sen. Thomas submitted S. Res. 155, to provide for consideration of H. R. 3484 by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee prior to floor action, and the resolution was ordered to lie on the table. Several other Senators also discussed this matter. (pp. 9663-71).

3. PERSONNEL. The Civil Service Committee reported the following bills without amendment (p. 9630):
   H. R. 1995, to provide for return of civil-service retirement deductions of employees separated before completing 10 years of service (S. Rept. 633).
   S. 1493, to give the Civil Service Commission final decision as to eligibility under the Veterans' Preference Act (S. Rept. 636).

4. GRAZING. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments S. 1367, to amend the Taylor Grazing Act regarding distribution of fees (S. Rept. 647)(p. 9630).

5. COMMITTEE STAFF. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee reported without amendment S. Res. 152, authorizing the Committee to make additional expenditures and employ temporary assistants (S. Rept. 651); to Rules and Administration Committee (p. 9630).

6. LAWS CODIFICATION. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1565, to codify and enact into positive law Title I of the U. S. Code, "General Provisions" (S. Rept. 658)(p. 9630).

7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. It is expected that the Senate today will consider the Reorganization Plan on housing and bills on the calendar (p. 9681).

HOUSE

8. FARM PROGRAM. The Rules Committee reported H.Res. 298, to authorize the Agriculture Committee to investigate any matter within its jurisdiction, including but not limited to the study of long-range problems affecting agriculture and forestry, effectiveness of measures to control foot-and-mouth disease, existence and causes of shortages and surpluses of food and other agricultural commodities, and the current and prospective demand for food and other agricultural commodities, at home and abroad (H.Rept. 1015) (pp. 9719, 9799).

9. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Passed as reported H.R. 4127, whoch contains the following provisions: (1) Retired employees now on the annuity rolls are to obtain increased annuity benefits, or in lieu thereof are permitted to obtain certain benefits for their surviving spouse; (2) provision is made for a more simple and more equitable method of computing annuities which raises annuities by approximately 5 percent in the higher salary groups to 25 percent in the lower brackets (an increase of 25 percent, or $300, whichever is the lesser, is provided for present annuitants); (3) Federal employees' contributions to the retirement fund are increased from 5 to 6 percent of such employees' basic salary; (4) retirement deductions are to be refunded to employees who have had less than 5 years of service, optional refunds are provided for those employees with from 5 to 10 years of service (excluding military service), but contributions to the retirement fund from employees with 10 or more years of service (excluding military service) are to be retained in the retirement fund until such age as annuities are provided; and (5) the so-called tontine service charge against Federal employees is eliminated (pp. 9763-75).

10. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Dirksen obtained unanimous consent for the Agricultural Appropriation subcommittee to have until midnight, July 21, to file a report (p. 9719).

11. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H.R. 3123, concurred in Senate action on 13 of the amendments reported in disagreement, and agreed with amendments to the remaining ten (pp. 9778-88).

will prevail, not only in Europe and Asia, but throughout all the world.

Adjournment of Congress now, with no thought of returning until the next regular session, will add strong support to such beliefs. It is my judgment that such will positively hinder and handicap the great work now being done by Secretary Marshall as he tries to give some assurance to the nations whose hopes and destinies are allied with our own. The appalling fear of those nations is that we may retreat and turn our backs to the Old World, by which course those friendly nations would be left to absolute domination from the outside.

Mr. President, the Marshall plan, or something akin to it, can be made to work. Notwithstanding differences which now exist even among the nations of western Europe, which differences can be worked out, some plan for the economic recovery of the nations of western Europe can be worked out and can be made effective. In helping those nations to help themselves—and that, basically, is the foundation of the Marshall plan—we are being cooperative and working together for the good of all, including our own country. In the rehabilitation and restoration of the economic stability of the Old World lies the hope of all nations, including those which do appear to be seeking the failure of that plan.

Mr. President, I have spoken earnestly of things which are mighty in prospect if they are done in the right way, but ominous in portent if they are done in the wrong way. The Congress should return early in the fall. It should take up its legislative work where it is being left off. Rested and refreshed, we should return and pass the needed legislation for diplaced persons. Every human instinct within us cries that this be done. We should consider flood control, as the President has recommended. The raging waters of swollen streams are not curbed or restricted by congressional recesses or sessions. Tax reforms, revision of minimum wage laws and all the other matters of pressing domestic concern would much better be considered and disposed of in the fall than to plunge them into the political pots which boil so furiously, and aften so destrucively, in campaign years. But above and beyound these things, I must repeat, is the question of world relations, questions which pertain to and may determine the safety, happiness, and peace of all men everywhere. Decision on these vital issues cannot wait until after November 1948, as some signs rather strongly indicate may be in the minds of some people.

Frankly, I say that, to some extent, there are today within both political parties political winds which seem to be blowing from strange directions. Some of them appear to blow round and around, as do the tornadoes which come with such force in our southwestern areas, and leave only destruction and death behind. The twisting winds of political ambitions of either men or parties must not be prevailing winds in these years of destiny. They must not be prevailing winds in our foreign relations this year, next year, or any year.

To avoid any possibility of political consideration, the Congress should recognize its duty to return to work early in the coming fall, and then meet those big issues which will be ready at that time—and if they are not ready then, the Congress will be ready to meet them whenever they arrive.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1947]

BUT IMPORTANT TO INFLATION—TRUMAN ADVISER CALLS BOOST IN COAL PRICES UNNECESSARY

(By Alfred Friendly)

The recent increase in coal prices, following the new wage contract with the United Mine Workers, is an "important but unnecessary" addition to inflation, John D. Clark, one of the three members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, declared last night.

Clark said the increases in mine prices for coal was "much more" than was required immediately by the boost in miners' wages. If private management is as efficient as most people believe it to be, he added, "No price increase at all may be necessary."

Clark's views, ranging from disappointed to bitter, were made known in an interview with the Post yesterday, on the eve of President Truman's midyear economic report to the Congress. The report, prepared in large part from information supplied by his Economic Council, will deal with the coal-cost situation as well as with other major economic developments and prospects.

Clark's principal contention yesterday was that the coal operators should have waited to change prices until they had given a fair test to the new wage contract and found out its real effect on costs.

"The President was thoroughly justified in making such a request for delay pending a fair test," Clark said.

He pointed out that for the first time in a long period there will be unrestrained private management operating the coal mines. This will provide entirely different conditions of operation from those which obtained during the past 4 years. That was a period of constant labor conflict and when the mines were in and out of Federal control five times, Clark argued.

"That period is not one which could provide a basis for accurate cost computations for the future," he asserted. "Now," he added, "controls have been removed, labor is content, and private management can show what it can do."

Clark, a former oil corporation president and dean of the University of Nebraska School of Business Administration, has made his own computation on what John L. Lewis' wage contract does to coal prices. For the small operator, he concludes, costs are raised about 25 cents a ton. For larger, more mechanized, and more efficient operators, he believes, no price increase at all appears to be called for.

But the coal operators, he pointed out, have already announced increases from 40 to 75 cents a ton. And the retailers have passed all of this increase on to the consumers and "then added a healthy additional profit for themselves."

Clark's computation of the added cost to the coal producers was based on this analysis of the new contract:

"All it does to the small operator's wage payments is to add $1.20 per day to the daily pay of each miner. If the average production in a mine is 6 tons per miner, and that is not an exceptional rate, this is an increased cost of 20 cents per ton.

"Add the extra 5 cents per ton for the welfare fund, and you have the total added cost of coal production in that mine. This assumes that the owner is no more efficient than an officer of the United States Navy in running his business enterprise."

The reference was to the Navy operation of coal mines for more than a year, when they had been seized by the Government.

Clark pleaded for steel operators not to follow the example of the coal mine owners. They must decide, he said, whether the dubious increase in the cost of their fuels will compel them to add the cost of production of every manufacturer in the land by increasing the price of steel and steel products.

He pointed out that the steelmakers' decision appears to be slated for a directors' meeting which will also have before it figures on steel earnings for the first half of this year.

BAD TIME FOR INCREASE

"Perhaps they will speculate about the profit figures they will see in the future if inflation is fed instead of curbed and if the country is hurried into trouble," he said.

"This is a bad time to add to the forces of inflation," Clark warned. "Only last week the wholesale price index for manufactured goods hit a new postwar high."

Clark's views on the exaggerated price effect of the coal miners' wage increases will presumably be reflected in Mr. Truman's report, to be given the Congress today.

Another major item of discussion in the report, it was indicated by White House sources, is the foreign-aid program and its possible effect on the domestic economy.

## AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. HATCH's speech,

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has just told me that he is very desirous of bringing up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and he asks me to yield for that purpose. As I am criticizing Congress for not performing its work expeditiously, I think I must yield, and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose.

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 16, 35, 37, 45, 48, and 53.

That House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert ", except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to

the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,143,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$503,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

Page 18, line 18, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "hereof," insert the following: "until June 30, 1949,".

Page 19, line 14, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "transfer" and the period, insert the following: "The Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land grant college Acts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,466,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$745,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,972,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ", to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances: *Provided further*, That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$856,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43, 50, 54, 57, and 59.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is it proposed to dispose of the conference report now? Will it involve some discussion?

Mr. BROOKS. It will probably take half an hour or more.

Mr. HATCH. Suppose the Senator allows me to finsh. I shall be through very shortly. I shall conclude as quickly as I can, and then the conference report can be considered. I promise the Senator to speed up my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understood, the Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Illinois to present the conference report.

Mr. HATCH. He did present the conference report. I thought I was to resume my address.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report having been presented, it is a privileged matter. In the opinion of the Chair it is now for the Senator from Illinois to accede to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that he be permitted to resume.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico how long it will take him to conclude his statement?

Mr. HATCH. The statement is longer than I had thought. It will require probably 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Then I should prefer to proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the appropriation bill is important. I shall now, with the permission of the Senate, yield to the Senator from Illinois, and then I should like to resume the floor and conclude my remarks. I should like to have the continuity of my remarks preserved in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair believes the Senator from New Mexico can rely on that being done.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum in connection with the consideration of the conference report, because it is of vital importance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hatch | Myers |
| Baldwin | Hawkes | O'Conor |
| Ball | Hayden | O'Daniel |
| Barkley | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Brewster | Hill | Overton |
| Bricker | Hoey | Pepper |
| Bridges | Holland | Reed |
| Brooks | Ives | Revercomb |
| Buck | Jenner | Robertson, Va. |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Byrd | Kem | Smith |
| Cain | Kilgore | Sparkman |
| Capehart | Knowland | Stewart |
| Capper | Langer | Taft |
| Chavez | Lodge | Taylor |
| Connally | Lucas | Thomas, Okla. |
| Cooper | McCarran | Thomas, Utah |
| Cordon | McClellan | Thye |
| Donnell | McFarland | Tydings |
| Downey | McGrath | Umstead |
| Dworshak | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Eastland | McMahon | Watkins |
| Ecton | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Ellender | Malone | White |
| Ferguson | Martin | Wiley |
| Flanders | Maybank | Williams |
| Fulbright | Millikin | Wilson |
| George | Moore | Young |
| Green | Morse | |
| Gurney | Murray | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. During the quorum call I have further explored the present situation. I find that it is necessary to have this bill returned to conference, and that probably some votes will be taken on special matters. Therefore, I have concluded that, with the permission of the Senate, I shall postpone my further remarks until this matter is disposed of.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I should outline, in the beginning, the exact situation which confronts the conferees on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The conferees have agreed on a number of items. There are approximately 10 that are still in disagreement. After explaining them, I shall move that the Senate agree to the conference report; and then it will be my purpose to move that the Senate insist on its disagreement as to certain amendments, and request a further conference.

The items as to which there has been agreement amount to a reduction of $8,000,000 in the cash appropriations and $29,000,000 in authorizations.

The items which are still in grave controversy are those relative to meat inspection, soil conservation use payments, school lunches, tenant loans, and penalty mail. They are the principal items as to which there is still disagreement. As I explained when the bill was originally before the Senate, they were the items upon which we had long discussion and lengthy hearings in the committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report, which includes the items to which we have thus far been able to agree.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3601, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*July 18, 1947.*

*Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$258,000,000" and insert "228,000,000"; in line 18 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$27,500,000" and insert "$22,000,000"; in line 43 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out all after "farmers", down to and including "Secretary" in line 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided,* That in expending the appropriation herein for 'Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry,' service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 43, 50, and 59 to said bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, Senate amendment No. 54 merely provides that—

Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).

The House further amended it as follows:

*Provided,* That in expending the appropriation herein for "Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry," service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 54.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the first item the House took up related to meat inspection. The budget estimate for meat inspection was $11,140,000. The House reduced that to $5,000,000, a net reduction of $6,140,000; provided that the $5,000,000 should be used as a revolving fund, and that henceforth all meat inspection should be paid for by the packers themselves. The Senate restored the entire $11,140,000. The House thereafter considered the item again, and voted to sustain its previous action and to disagree with the Senate amendment.

I think a slight explanation of this item might be helpful. Meat inspection was established in the United States by law in 1906. That act originated in the Agricultural Committee. During the years, meat inspection has gradually increased in its importance. Before the war approximately 600 packers were availing themselves of the meat inspection. During the war the number increased to 940. There are approximately 12,000,000,000 pounds of meat slaughtered in the packing plants in the United States each year, and the cost of this inspection is approximately one-tenth of 1 cent a pound.

Last year and for some years previous, the packers asked for overtime work by the meat inspectors. The Federal Government did not pay for that, but the packers used the Federal Government inspectors and paid for their services. That amounted to approximately 30 percent, or $2,406,000, which was paid by the packers for the overtime expenses of the meat inspection.

The arguments in favor of continuing meat inspection are that it was established, pursuant to the recommendation of the Agricultural Committee, under a legislative act, that it was designed to benefit the health of the people of the United States, and that it should be continued at a cost to all the people of the United States.

On the other hand, it is said that 30 percent of the meat is not inspected, and that it has become quite a sales argument to have the Federal inspection stamp on the meat, and that having the packers pay the inspection fee will not in any way change the method of inspection, for all the inspectors will be continued as civil-service employees, with all their present rights, and will be paid by the Government, and will work for the Government, and the packers will pay the fees to be collected by the Government itself. We discussed this item rather fully in our committee, and the committee was rather of the mind that it should be retained.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist upon its disagreement with the House of Representatives on amendments 18 and 19, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the next item relates to soil-conservation use payments. That item was thoroughly explained, I think, when we considered the bill. I shall state it briefly again: The budget estimate was for $301,000,000 to carry out a soil-conservation use payment program which was specifically authorized in the appropriation bill for 1947. The House cut the item to $165,000,000, allowing only $150,000,000 for payment to farmers, and $15,000,000 for administrative expenses under the act. The Senate restored the payments in full. The Senate restored them by appropriating $258,000,000, and authorizing the Department of Agriculture to utilize $37,000,000, which now is in its possession. That would make $295,000,000. Two hundred and sixty-seven million dollars of it would go for the payments, and we reduced the administrative expenses to $27,500,000. The House has acted upon this item twice. In its consideration of the original bill, the House voted to adopt the action of the House committee by reducing the item to $165,000,000; and after the conference of the House conferees with the conferees on the part of the Senate, the House voted to maintain the position it had previously taken, and the House disagreed with the Senate's position. However, the House did more at that time. In its original action, the House not only reduced the $301,000,000 to $165,000,000 and reduced the payments for administrative expenses, but the House also eliminated any provision for a program for the year 1948. The Senate restored the full payments and voted $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, and authorized a $150,000,000 program for next year, with additional restrictions, namely, that the program and payments should be based upon need, that not more than a 15-percent change in the allocations to the various States could take place within that formula of need, and that no recipient could receive more than a $500 payment.

Under the present law the limit is $10,000. It was shown that the vast majority of those participating in the program received the smaller payments. Out of the 3,404,000 participants, 2,150,000 received $60 or less, and 596,000 received $100 or less. Eighty percent of the

farmers of the country received not more than $100, and only 1.2 percent received more than $500.

If the amendment stands as the House has finally acted upon it, the payments are reduced. I shall state the parliamentary procedure so that Senators will understand how the action was arrived at.

The Senate provided for the $295,000,000 program and sent the bill back to the House in that form. The House voted to recede from their first position. Then promptly an amendment was offered to reduce the payments by $30,000,000, and the House eliminated the provision for the ensuing year, which would mean that instead of having $258,000,000 for payments, there would be $228,000,000, and instead of having $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, $22,000,000 would be allowed. There would be no program for 1948, and under the present program no one could receive more than $500.

Mr. President, this is a program which has been discussed rather fully, but for the purpose of speed I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would accept an amendment which would make certain that the Senate would insist on its entire position in this matter, appropriate $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, the full amount for the 1947 program, and reinstate the $150,000,000 program for next year.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is included in my motion. The original position which I asked to be sustained by my motion does include $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, and the program for next year calling for $150,000,000.

Mr. YOUNG. With that understanding, I shall not offer any further motion, but I should like to discuss the amendment for 5 minutes or less.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this late day in the session, and with an appreciation of the importance of much legislation pending, I shall not in detail discuss the necessity for soil conservation, except to say that this program has made possible the tremendous production of farm commodities the Nation has witnessed in the last 4 or 5 years. I do not think I need tell the Members of the Senate that all agricultural programs are tied in with the conservation and land-use program. That includes crop insurance, price support, and other arrangements whereby the Department of Agriculture frequently is enabled to call on farmers to increase greatly certain crop acreages in order to get needed increases in production of certain commodities. For instance, in the last year the acreage sown to flax had to be stepped up very largely to meet the needs of the United States. At the present time there is a program to reduce potato acreage, and that program cannot be carried on successfully without the farmer-committeemen system we now have in connection with the conservation and land-use program.

Nor do I think I need tell the Senate that more than 16,000,000 acres of land not in crop production in 1939 now are in crop production, and are being cultivated by farmers and if we do not have a soil-conservation program which will retire these acres, a very bad soil-erosion situation will result. Soil fertility and the preservation of production resulting is a vital necessity both in time of war and peace. The farmers' tremendous production during this war had more to do with our victory than any other single factor, with the exception of the services rendered by the armed forces on the field of battle. It is to the benefit of the whole Nation that we look after soil conservation.

Without saying more in that regard, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a statement of principles, policies, and objectives of Republican Members of Congress adopted Wednesday, December 5, 1945, and shortly thereafter adopted unanimously by the Republican National Committee meeting in Chicago, December 8, 1945, a meeting at which Republican State chairmen and others were present.

I am happy to know that the Republican majority in Congress has followed faithfully these resolutions, particularly in regard to tax readjustment, labor legislation, bipartisan foreign policy, economy and many other matters set out in this document. I think the Republican leaders in the Senate are to be congratulated for religiously following that program. I particularly commend the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

I find, at the end of this statement of principles and objectives, the following paragraph in regard to agriculture, which I think so far the House by their actions has failed to carry out. I do not think the Senate has failed, but I think the House has totally disregarded this statement, which reads:

> We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

Mr. President, in my judgment, by totally eliminating the conservation and land-use program for next year, and by cutting $6,000,000 from the $37,000,000 appropriation for the soil conservation district service, I do not believe the majority in Congress is following out its statement of principles and its pledge to the American farmer.

It certainly cannot be argued that we are faithfully following our objectives and our statement in regard to soil conservation if we eliminate completely a program which has Nation-wide coverage, and at the same time eliminate $6,000,000 from the appropriation for the soil conservation district service, which does remarkable work, but does not cover the whole United States.

I am sure the Republican Members of Congress are going to remember this pledge. If we are to eliminate soil conservation, let us make that the issue in the next campaign. I wonder how many votes would be lost in agricultural areas by Republicans if we did make this an issue, and adopt it as our policy.

I might say that in my campaign last year I stood on these principles and statements adopted by the Republican Members of Congress, and the official organ of the Republican Party. I for one, am not going back on those principles and the promises I made to the public and particularly to the farmers of my State.

Let us fight this out along these lines if we have to remain in session another month.

Mr. YOUNG subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of principles, policies, and objectives of the Republican Members of Congress, as adopted on December 5, 1945, be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would say that I would object, if we were not rushed for time, because I do not often have an opportunity to hear read a good Republican document. Under the circumstances, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—APPROVED BY THE REPUBLICANS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AFTER CONSIDERATION AND CONFERENCE ACTION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1945

Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency, and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on these American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice.

In foreign affairs we shall continue to strive to avoid partisanship. But we shall also seek to avoid secrecy, inefficiency, and drift.

To these purposes we dedicate the following statement:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We look with particular hope to the General Assembly as the town meeting of the world wherein the organized conscience of mankind shall find effective expression in behalf of peace with justice.

We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization.

We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery. We demand sound management and protection against exploitation in this connection. We will as-

sist other nations to rehabilitate themselves under arrangements consistent with intelligent American self-interest and over-all limitations that shall not jeopardize our own economic recovery and stability.

We believe in fulfilling to the greatest possible degree our war pledges to small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We deplore any question of these principles."

We will seek to find common policies with the other great powers. But we reject great-power domination of the world and the thesis that world peace requires us to endorse alien doctrines or to abandon efforts to seek justice for the weaker peoples of the world.

We advocate ultimate international agreements to stabilize military establishments. We demand open diplomacy, a' home and abroad, and free communication throughout the world.

We consider that the maintenance of a strong, solvent, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world order.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We stand for a well-trained and fully equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force adequate to meet any emergency under future conditions of warfare. It must be supported by the most modern scientific research, a strong industrial system, and adequate reserves of trained men with the best weapons and equipment.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Government alone cannot feed the people, nor employ them, nor make the profits from which new enterprises and new jobs are born. Government can help its people to prosperity by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes, laying down the rules of fair play, and protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We believe that equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

We deplore the political tactics which have resulted in class consciousness and strife. We oppose those who would destroy us through the continuation of such strife and struggle.

Our tax burden must be equitably distributed. Taxes must be so imposed as to stimulate creative enterprise, not destroy it, and to afford the individual adequate purchasing power. Tax forms and taxpaying must be simplified. There must be an incentive for business to expand production and employment and for the individual to invest his savings in such expansion. There must be a fair return to both labor and investors if we are to have jobs for the workers, goods for the consumers, and adequate revenue for the Government.

The solvency of our Government must be assured. Outlay must be brought in line with income. The value of the dollar must be maintained.

Economy in Government spending must be achieved. Extravagant Government spending now advocated by the administration in every field can lead only to ruin. Programs involving expenditure of Federal funds should not be undertaken unless the justification therefor is clearly established.

Wartime limitations, restrictions, and controls must be removed. The instant a right or liberty can be returned to the people, it shall be returned. Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Bureaucracy, with its thirst for power and self-perpetuation, must be drastically reduced. The number of Government employees must be cut to an efficient minimum.

We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.

For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.

The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.

Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

We favor Federal aid to the extent necessary, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, and responsibility, without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the rest of the population who pay the bills.

We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

A grateful Nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. The best of medical care and rehabilitation, education, and training for all desiring it, and efficient assistance in securing homes, farms, businesses, and real jobs, must be provided for the veteran. Nothing in the Federal program should lessen the responsibility of each local community to provide for the return to civilian life of its gallant sons and daughters in a spirit of understanding, helpfulness, and dignity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and insist of its amendment numbered 42.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations on this issue, because I regard it as one of the most important questions the Congress will consider at this session.

I hope that when the vote is taken on this motion we will be allowed a record vote. If the motion of the Senator from Illinois does not deserve a record vote, there will be no question before the Senate at this session or any other session on which Members of Congress should go on record.

Mr. President, wrapped up in these amendments are two vital questions. The first is, Shall the Congress live up to its contracts, shall it carry through a program to which it has been obligated under a congressional mandate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not like to interrupt him at the very beginning of his speech, but when he refers to two amendments, will he not explain exactly what the two amendments are, their relation to the budget estimates, their relation to the House action, and their relation to the Senate action?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall undertake to do that, but I desire to make a brief over-all statement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. I merely wish to comment on the conference committee report, and then to make a few brief remarks concerning appropriations, and if the Senator will yield for that purpose, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my remarks. I do not intend to speak at any great length.

Mr. THYE. I am seeking the floor to make a few brief remarks on the appropriations for agriculture. I merely wanted to let the Senator know what I had in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will do so. I should prefer to have him to do it in his own time.

Mr. THYE. I most certainly will, sir.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should prefer not to yield. Mr. President, the soil-conservation program has been in operation in one form and another since 1933. Each year the Congress makes an appropriation to provide payments to farmers, which payments compensate them in part for the expenditures they have made in carrying out soil-conserving practices on their farms. Back in the days of the processing taxes, the payments at times aggregated approximately $900,000,000. They were paid to farmers for terracing their lands, for contour plowing, for applying lime, phosphates, and other soil-enriching minerals, for planting leguminous crops and for devoting lands to proper uses. Payments have been made in small amounts for the planting of forests, for the reseeding of pastures, and for other practices which will preserve the most priceless asset the Nation possesses, namely, the fertility of the soil.

With the ruling by the Supreme Court invalidating the original processing taxes, the Congress enacted a law authorizing appropriations in the sum of $500,000,000 a year, in order that the program might continue. For some 8 or 9 years the Congress each year appropriated $500,000,000 to defray a part of the costs, and authorized for the succeeding year a program of soil conservation.

We are not dealing here, Mr. President, with a war-swollen agency. We have here an agency which took its reductions during the war. At the advent of war, the soil-conservation payments authorized for the year 1946 were reduced from $500,000,000 to $400,000,000; for

1947, in the 1946 bill, there was authorized $300,000,000. In 1946, when the authorization for 1947 was pending, in order that there could be no misunderstanding about the matter, the language of the authorization was framed in such a way as to impose a contractual obligation on the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate a $300,000,000 soil-conservation program for the crop year 1947.

Mr. President, I wish to read the language which authorized the appropriation, which the other body seeks now to reduce:

*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1947 programs, amounting to $300,000,000, including administration, of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

Mr. President, in the past, this language had read "not to exceed" a certain amount. But in order that there could be no misunderstanding in the minds of farmers as to the scope of the program, knowing the mind of the Eightieth Congress as to what was intended, I wish to read the language that was cited on the floor of the House of Representatives handling the bill, Judge TARVER, of Georgia. On March 8, 1946, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses this statement:

Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few months ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program, $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

Mr. President, with that statement by the chairman of the committee, the House, by a vote of more than 4 to 1, adopted a program of $300,000,000 in payments for 1947, and that amendment and that language was adopted by the Senate by unanimous vote. It is a firm commitment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to ask three or four questions. I desire to get my thinking straight on what this conference report really contains. I am sorry that I do not have it clearly in mind now, apparently because the report I have as to what the committee has done is so shocking to me that I do not want to believe it, unless it comes from the lips of the Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the highest respect when it comes to the matter of farm practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], I have followed very closely his activities as chairman of the committee, and I think he is to be commended for the work he has done in his endeavor to prevent an unjustifiable wrong, which I think has been done by the report which has come to the floor of the Senate. Before I put a question, may I make a brief remark to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], that mine is one vote that will never approve the conference report that has come back to the floor of the Senate, because I am not going to sell short either the farmers of America or the economy of this country, as I think we would be doing if we voted for this entirely unjustifiable conference report.

Now, my first question is this: Am I correctly informed that this report proposes to cut the school-lunch program back to the $45,000,000 originally allowed by the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the conference report does not reach the school-lunch amendment. It is still in disagreement. The Senate conferees refused to yield to the House on the $45,000,000, or the limitation which destroys the program in all but four or five States, and that item is still in disagreement. When the pending amendment shall have been disposed of, the school-lunch amendment will be the next in order, and the Senate will have an opportunity then to say whether they wish to reduce the program to $45,000,000, and to destroy it by the limitation that was imposed in the House.

Mr. MORSE. Since I am on my feet, and that point has been mentioned, let me say that I do not propose to economize at the expense of the health and the stomachs of the school children of America. If that happens to be the program of any group in the Congress, I am perfectly willing to take that issue to the election platforms of America in 1948.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say that I share the Senator's view.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to ask the Senator from Georgia a question in regard to the conservation program. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that all throughout the war we economized unnecessarily, but because of the exigencies of the war, on the soil-conservation program?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about that. The appropriations were reduced from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000 for soil conservation, and the $212,000,00 parity payment appropriations were eliminated entirely. The agricultural appropriation bill is the only major bill that comes before the Congress with any substantial reduction over the 1940 appropriations. In 1940 the Congress of the United States appropriated $1,650,000,000 for agriculture. The President's estimates for the present year were only $1,300,000,000, a reduction of $350,000,000, and the House of Representatives proceeded to cut $400,000,000 off of that. Involved in those cuts are the amendments which are now in disagreement.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that when we spend a dollar for preserving and revitalizing the soil of the farms of America we are bound in the decades to come to receive many dollars in return for every dollar we expend on a soil-conservation program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the magnificent production of the American farmer in the war period answers the Senator's question. Without the soil conservation program, which has been practiced for some 10 years, it would have been impossible for the American farmer to produce the food and fiber which not only fed and clothed our people and our armies, but which kept our allies in the war at a time when they were about to be overcome. But bear in mind, Mr. President, the soil-conservation program suffered during the war period because we were mining our lands to produce the increased crops which were so necessary at that time. Instead of reducing the farm program at this time, if we really believe in soil conservation, as we tell Kiwanis Clubs and the members of other gatherings as we speak to them that we do, Congress would be justified in restoring the program back to $500,000,000, instead of cutting the program back to a paltry $150,000,000 for next year, as we have been compelled to do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the fertility of the American farms happens to be the most important line of defense we have from the standpoint of the security of the Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about that, Mr. President. We may appropriate moneys with which to build airplanes, with which to construct tanks, and with which to provide all the impedimenta and implements of war without limit, but unless we have the food and the fiber with which to feed and clothe the men who operate the tanks and the airplanes, as well as the civilian workers behind them in the industries at home, it will avail us nothing.

All that is necessary to do, in order to find what happens to a nation which neglects to provide for maintenance of the fertility of its soil, is to read the histories of the great civilizations and nations of the past which neglected to maintain the fertility of their soil so as to provide for the feeding and the clothing of their people. Go to the lands which were so fertile back in Bible times, and there will be seen today only bare rocks and worn-out soils which will not produce a livelihood for anyone. Even the Garden of Eden, so vividly described in the Bible as a land which produced the greatest abundance of all things, is today the scene of utter desolation because the people who lived there did not protect their soil from erosion and destruction.

In the great Sahara Desert, cities have been uncovered proving that great civilizations once flourished there. But now the land is desolate and unproductive.

What happened to the great civilizations of Rome and Greece shows the results that ensue when peoples do not protect their soils and can therefore no longer provide the food and fiber necessary to their maintenance.

Mr. President, with that history so clearly before us, the Senate of the United States is now compelled to fight and quibble in order that any soil-protection program may be carried on for the next year. I have been amazed at the fact that the action of other other body, which stops the program completely for the next year, has not been more widely publicized. Newspapers which grow lyrical in their editorial columns respecting soil conservation have not mentioned in their news columns that the other body by two record votes have said there should be no soil-conservation program whatever next year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Georgia for his answer to my question, and I am in complete agreement with him respecting the matter. I think it illustrates again two points that need to be driven home. One deals with the tax-reduction program which the Senator from Georgia and I opposed the other day. It illustrates again that the American farmers must appreciate the fact that the type of economy which is now attempted to be foisted upon them takes out of one pocket many more dollars than was attempted by politicians to put in another pocket by way of a tax-reduction program.

The second point it illustrates is the argument about the American farmer working so many days out of ten for the Government. Let me tell the American farmer now that if this type of a raid on his best long-time interest is permitted to be made, he will find that the Congress will have sold his economic interests short. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is time the American farmer should awaken to what is being done to him by the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the sponsors of the action which would destroy the program in the future say that the farmers are not interested in the program. I point to the fact that every spokesman for every farm group in the country appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and implored the Senate committee to extend the program into 1948. The American farmers would be up in arms if they realized what was about to be done to them by the action of the other body in stopping this program next year. I am somewhat amazed that the Senate has agreed to reduce the appropriation to the paltry sum of $150,000,000 for next year.

The farmers are now spending $3 for every one the Federal Government expends for soil-conservation purposes. Under the reduced appropriation for next year the farmers will be compelled to increase their share of the expenditures. Yet we are told that in the name of economy Congress is going to destroy a program which has been 12 or 13 years in the building and, on which billions of dollars have been spent. It is proposed that we strike down and destroy the county-committee system. If we do, it will cost untold sums over any economic loss of fertility of soil and reduction of production of food and fiber, when attempt is made at some later period to pick up the odds and ends and recreate a program which has been so effective in the past.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator made an observation a moment ago upon which I think we should dwell a little more at this time in the debate. As the Senator said, our fertile and rich land produced all the food and fiber which were so necessary during the war to provide for our soldiers and for the world, nevertheless at that very time, as the Senator well knows and as everyone else knows, the soil itself was being overworked, just as the machinery on the farm was being overworked. Yet now, at a time when that soil needs more attention than it has needed since the soil-conservation program went into effect, due to a spirit of false economy, in my opinion, on the part of the House of Representatives, we find that the House after 1948 wants no soil-conservation program at all, and even under the Senate provision the amount for such purpose is cut down to $150,000,000.

The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct when he says that the farmers of the Nation want this kind of program. Why do they want this kind of program? Not only because of what they know soil conservation has done for these farms which were worn out in practically every State in the Union, but also because the Congress of the United States made a pledge to the farmers. The Congress of the United States made a contract with the American farmer last year, when we wrote into the bill the provision which the Senator so aptly described. It seems to me the present Congress, in the name of economy, is constantly violating the sanctity of contracts which we have embodied in the statute books. A classical example is what Congress did with respect to the appropriation on the aviation program, after having told the cities of the country that they could prepare to proceed with a 7-year program.

We heretofore told the farmers of America "You can get ready to proceed with a soil-conservation program as laid down by the Congress." We further said, "Mr. Farmer, you can depend upon that." But the next Congress comes along and repudiates an honest, solemn obligation and pledge to the American people.

Mr. President, if the executive branch of the Government were repudiating its pledges and obligations, we would find seven different committees investigating the executive branch of the Government and the reasons for the repudiation of those pledges; and yet Congress repudiates them time without number, without batting an eye.

Repeatedly on the floor of the Senate I have heard the argument about the sanctity of contracts. The Senator from Georgia knows that if this were an arrangement between two private individuals, one or the other would be in court day after tomorrow if a contract of this kind were repudiated.

I cannot understand a Republican Congress which would absolutely violate, with impunity, a solemn pledge which was made by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Georgia has called our attention to the fact that in 1940 Congress appropriated $1,650,000,000 for the agricultural program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And that the budget estimate submitted to the Congress this year called for $1,200,000,000, but the House cut it down to $800,000,000, which was less than half of what was actually appropriated for the last year before the war.

The Senator also called attention to the fact that by a majority of 3 or 4 to 1 in the House—and I was one of those in the House at that time who voted with the majority—and by a unanimous vote in the Senate, we promised the farmers a $300,000,000 soil-conservation program for the fiscal year 1948. Will the Senator tell us how much the House wants to cut this amount below what the Senate has already approved for this work?

Mr. RUSSELL. In its final action on these amendments yesterday, as I understand, the House cut $30,000,000 from the Senate figure. That would mean that the farmers would have to take approximately a 15-percent reduction in the very important commitment which was made to them, on the basis of which thousands of farmers have already expended money, relying in good faith on the Government to pay them.

The House further amended the bill by limiting any payment which could be made under the 1947 program to $500 to any one individual and cut out and destroyed any soil-conservation program for 1948.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let us get clear in our minds the amount of money which the Senator is asking the Senate to restore to the bill, or to insist upon as it goes back to conference with the House, which seeks to cut the appropriation below what the Senate allowed. How much is involved?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am urging the Senate to insist on its original amendment reported by the committee, which allowed an appropriation of $258,000,000, plus certain unexpended balances which were sufficient to pay every farmer every dollar that had been promised to him under the 1947 contracts, and which would have set up a measly program of $150,000,000 for the year 1948.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Then all the Senator is asking us to do is to live up to our definite commitments for this fiscal year, plus a very small amount to go forward into the next fiscal year for the continuation of this essential program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia has expressed the position of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that Fred Brenckman, for many years the legislative agent of the National Grange, told me that if topsoil were worth only $1 a ton, the American farmers, through the floods of 1947, had already lost $800,000,000. If one were to

try to purchase topsoil in Washington, I guarantee that he would not get any kind of topsoil for a dollar a ton.

Is it not a fact that last year we exported about 18,000,000 tons of food abroad?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has never been any nation in all history that has exported as much foodstuffs as our Nation has exported. All the nations of the world combined have never in any one year exported as much foodstuffs as we sent overseas during the past year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that in meeting the war demands and the post-war demands for food at home and abroad, our farmers, with less labor and with inadequate machinery, stepped up their production over the prewar figure from 30 to 35 percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is reflected by the record. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that there are but three nations left in the world which have surplus food for export, namely, Canada, the United States, and Argentina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know as to that. I suppose Australia probably has some food to export. She exports a good deal of mutton.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. She may export some meat. I am thinking principally of food grains.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that since our farmers are now producing above our domestic needs with respect to many commodities, and especially food grains, the export market, on an unprecedented scale, is preserving the present parity, or slightly above parity, prices for many farm products? For example, last year we exported 500,000,000 bushels of wheat, against the highest previous export of 200,000,000 bushels, and only 20,000,000 bushels in the early 1930's.

Mr. RUSSELL. That fact has undoubtedly contributed to the maintenance of farm prices.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. To a large extent, we are supporting that export market by loans and gifts. We all know that we cannot indefinitely support it on that basis. Is it not true, therefore, that the time will inevitably come when farm prices will drop; and if the pattern of the past, following World War I, should be followed, the farmer would be the first to be deflated? He was deflated in the latter part of 1920, after the other war, and he did not get out of the depression until 1940, 20 years later.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is an unbroken rule of economics, which has no exception in all recorded history, that the farmer is the last to benefit by rising prices and the first to feel the effects of any recession.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that 30,000,000 people in the United States depend upon agriculture for their livelihood?

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does not the general prosperity of our Nation reflect the prosperity of those 30,000,000 people who normally spend everything they get every year as they get it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If we deflate our agricultural industry, affecting 30,000,000 people who in one way or another are dependent upon agriculture, and if we sit by and see farm prices drop, shall we not then know that we have started into the next depression?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question about it. It has undoubtedly been the course of history that when the farmer does not prosper there gradually ensues a creeping paralysis which starts with the country banks and country merchants, and finally stops the smoke from pouring from the chimneys of our greatest industries.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed for only a few minutes, let me say that there is no question that the good faith of the Government of the United States is involved in paying every dollar which has been promised to the farmers on the 1947 contracts. It would be just as logical to say to a man who had built a ship that cost $10,000,000 that we would not pay more than seven-and-one-half millions of dollars, as it would be to pare down the farm payments for this year 25 percent. The farmers have already earned those payments in many cases. A farmer cannot adjust his crop to the vagaries of the House Appropriations Committee reporting a bill in May or June. He has to plan his crop in November and December of the preceding year. That was done with respect to these payments, and the farmers are entitled to fair treatment, and the Congress of the United States will dishonor itself if it does not make good on every dollar of appropriations.

The farmers mined their soil during the war. We lost more ground than was gained by our great struggle to rebuild the soil of the Nation. Yet it is proposed to tell the farmer that we shall have no program whatever next year and that we will not pay him what we promised him on the current year's program. The program next year means a great deal to the Nation. As I have stated, this appropriation is a paltry one—only $150,000,000 under the Senate provision which the other body refuses to accept.

The continuance of the program is important, because it keeps together the machinery which has proven so effective in protecting the farmer against surpluses, in seeing that he secures his commodity loans.

In every agricultural county in the United States there is a county committee which meets and works with the farmers on the program of agriculture for the county. If we do not have a program next year we will break the promise we made to the farmer that we would support his prices at a certain level. The program can be carried out only through the county committees. If we destroy the program for next year we shall practically ruin the loan program of 90 percent of parity on major products.

What does the program mean to the wheat farmer? It means a great deal, because freight cars are not available to the farmers in which to transport their wheat to the market and sell it immediately, and they are thus compelled to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge their obligations pending the time when freight cars can be secured to transport the wheat to the markets. If we destroy this program, as is proposed by the other body, we shall have destroyed the entire loan program, the section 32 program, and all the other related programs.

This has been a very democratic program with a little "d." The farmers select the men who run the program at the county level. That has been the great strength of the program. During the war, when flax had to be produced in this country, we could have issued statements from Washington every day of the week urging the farmers to produce flax, and we would not have procured sufficient flax to fill a person's eye. But when we sent word to the county committees, and the members of the committees traveled about and saw the individual farmers, the farmers made a magnificent production of flax, which was an essential product, without which we could not have won the war.

The same statement applies to almost every other commodity. Yet, Mr. President, it is now proposed to tell the farmers, in spite of the war production, in spite of the fact that they had to mine their own soil and take from its fertility in order to produce the food and fiber needed, that Congress will reduce their payments for this year and do away with the program for next year.

We have dealt differently with industry. We had a reconversion program with regard to industry for which we generously provided. The American manufacturers of essentials for war purposes were paid generously and liberally on their contracts. While restoration of industry is important in reconversion, it is no more important than is soil conservation. The farmers of America deserve better treatment at the hands of the Congress than they have received.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The amount of money paid to industry was $6,500,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a tremendous sum of money. I did not know the exact figures.

I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his efforts in this matter, and to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the motion which he had made.

I would regret, Mr. President, to see the farm program become involved in party politics. During the period in which it was my privilege to handle the agricultural appropriation bills on the floor of this body, I endeavored to separate the subject as far from partisan considerations as was humanly possible. If the farmers were to come to the committee offices next January and find them closed and find that the soil conservation program had been concluded, and that Congress had put an end to the section 32 funds, I have no doubt what

the political reaction would be. However, this matter is too important to become involved in party politics.

I went over to the other House when they were voting the other day and was talking to a Representative who happened to be a Democrat. I said to him, "What are you going to do?" He said, "I am afraid I am going to win." I said, "Afraid you are going to win? I hope you will win." He said, "If the Republicans kill soil conservation, nullify the school-lunch program, and deny money to the veterans for farm loans, they will never beat me in the election." I do not want these subjects to become involved in partisan questions. I am delighted that there has been no partisanship on this side of the Chamber. We are looking to the welfare of agriculture as a whole, and I hope, Mr. President, that we shall determine to stand by the Senate's position on this question. Whether Congress shall adjourn this coming Saturday or the Saturday following, certainly keeping faith with the American farmers is more important than adjourning on a certain date. Assuredly, to maintain a program of soil conservation, to enable us to keep faith in the support program, and other issues, is more important than could possibly be our own personal convenience in getting home next Saturday night.

I hope that the vote on these amendments, Mr. President, will be unanimous, that the Senate will stand by the Government's contracts for this year, and that the AAA offices throughout the Nation will be kept open in the year 1948.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, again I state that I commend the conference committee on its stand on some of the issues involved, and I ask them to continue to insist on the Senate provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill.

In the matter of meat inspection, if there is no appropriation for Federal meat inspection, the producer will pay the cost of such inspection. The packer will put the cost upon the producer, and the producer will pay for the inspection of the meat, which is to the benefit of the public in general. That should never be, because the producers constitute only a small percentage of the people of this Nation, and meat inspection is a benefit to the public in general.

Regarding the question of soil conservation, that, again, is a public responsibility. Every year we find a greater percentage of the people in the cities than we find on the farms or in the producing groups. When we consider the benefits, Mr. President, which the soil-conservation program has brought to the agricultural lands of the Nation, we must realize that it has been of benefit to all the people, rather than simply to a small producers' group. It will be found from the record that from 1938 through 1945 the application of limestone to the soil, which is a soil-building practice, is almost a necessity in many areas in order to get a good stand in legume seeding. The application of limestone was increased by 326 percent, and the use of fertilizer on grasses and legume crops was increased by 503 percent in those years. Field stripping, which is a soil-building practice in every sense, was increased by 854 percent in the years from 1938 to 1945. I repeat the years in order that the Senate may keep definitely in mind what has been accomplished under this particular type of program.

The appropriation for contour farming was increased 126 percent. The appropriation for construction of grass waterways to prevent erosion was increased 5,400 percent. The appropriation for the use of green manure for a cover crop, so to speak, was increased 65 percent. The appropriation for the construction of dams and ponds to avoid erosion and the gutting of fields by erosion was increased by 126 percent.

So, Mr. President, again I say that this particular type of program is a public benefit. It may be asked, "Do the cities have a responsibility to pay taxes to support such a program?" Mr. President, if we realize the tonnage of food which must be produced on the land in order to feed the people in cities the size of Washington, New York, Boston, and innumerable others which I could mention, then we commence to have an idea of what is being taken out of the soil in order to feed people who are not living on the farms. There is a public responsibility. Although some persons may say, "Yes; we pay in taxes for this program, but we receive nothing in return," and although I could refer to charts which were inserted in the RECORD within the last week, which would seem to indicate that cities such as Boston and New York which contributed their proportionate amounts got nothing in return, nevertheless they were paying for only a part of what they had depleted from the soil in order that food might be shipped to their people.

Soil conservation is a responsibility which we cannot shirk. When we contemplate appropriating not one dime for soil-conservation land use payments for the year 1948, I think we are making a very serious mistake. The Steagall amendment carries through 1948, and it provides for the price-support program for agriculture. There are other provisions, such as those relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which expire in the year 1948. Of course, studies must be made and a farm program must be developed between now and December 31, 1948. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that those studies must be made and such a program must be formulated, I feel that we definitely owe to the large and vitally important group engaged in agricultural pursuits who are producing food for the people of this Nation, as well as food with which to fulfill the commitments we have made abroad, a continuation of the soil-conservation practices in the year 1948, until we have been able to develop and perfected a farm program which will carry on when the Steagall amendments and the other provisions which are a part of the present program expire.

In my opinion the soil-conservation practices are nonpolitical. They are beneficial not only to the people living on the land, but to the people who consume the food, no matter in what corner of the United States they may reside.

Although the chairman of the committee of conference, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], has not referred to the Rural Electrification Administration in connection with this bill, I wish to say that this is another public service which has been of greater benefit to the people on the farms than almost any other measure the Congress has enacted. It may be said that we can reduce the appropriation by $25,000,000 this year, and still leave ample funds with which to carry on that work, but I think we shall make a most serious mistake if we take that attitude. Not a mile of line of rural electrification can be contracted for today for the same amount of money for which it could have been constructed 5 or 6 years ago, because the costs of both labor and material and equipment have increased greatly, just as every other cost has increased. When we consider that in this Union there are States in which only 12 percent of the farms are electrified—such States as the Dakotas—and when we consider the fact that in some of the New England areas more than 90 percent of the rural homes are electrified—and I could refer to my own State of Minnesota, where in excess of 57 percent of the farms are electrified—nevertheless we must realize that all other farmers are equally anxious to have electricity on their farms.

Under the rural electrification program, it is provided that an association may borrow money from the Treasury and shall pay it back with interest. As a matter of fact, in most cases the money is paid back in advance of the due date. The entire record under the REA program shows that the transactions have been only book transactions by which the money is made available to associations, to enable them to engage in construction under this program, and then the associations immediately commence to pay back the money, with interest. Mr. President, it will be a serious mistake to cut this item for the REA $25,000,000. Certainly it will be a mistake if that cut is allowed to stand, because then we shall deny that safety measure, that convenience, the current and power which will increase the production of food. In the event that this money is not made available there will be a delay of another year before many of these associations will be able to proceed to complete their line development or their project development.

Mr. President, I am mindful of the fact that we need to economize, and I am equally mindful of the fact that it is difficult for the Appropriations Committee to draw the two ends together, when we are constantly urging that appropriations for this measure or that measure be increased. But this rural electrification item is most important, and I do not think a reduction of it will result in economy.

I wish to make brief mention of the school-lunch program. The appropriation for that purpose would correct the

eating habits of many a youth, and would correct malnutrition insofar as the diet of school children is concerned. It is a safety measure, a safeguard, and a protection, as well as a correction of the eating habits of children who are improperly fed in their own homes.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall encourage and give whatever support I can to action designed to insist on maintaining the position the Senate has taken on this bill; and in whatever contacts I can make with Members of the House of Representatives who have refused to concur in the Senate's action on the Agricultural appropriation bill, I shall do all I can to persuade them to concur in the action of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the matter before the Senate has been so ably discussed by the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Minnesota that there seems to be little left to add to what they have said. Therefore, what I have to say I shall make very brief.

All life on this earth, the life of every human being, the life of every animal, the life of every bird, every fish, and every tree and plant, depends upon a thin layer of topsoil which spreads over the earth, which averages a little more than 8 inches in depth. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, the Nations which have neglected to care for their topsoil, which have let it deteriorate, which have let it become eroded and unproductive, have perished.

Mr. President, the United States has been generously endowed with this life-giving soil from which we all sprang. We have had what seemed to be unlimited millions of acres of soil on which to produce bountiful harvests, and we have produced such harvests, but we have not put back into the soil as much as we have taken out of it. Consequently, much of it has become so depleted and eroded that today it is almost valueless.

However, we were endowed not only with millions of acres of rich soil, but we were endowed also with the wisdom of seeing that we must maintain it if we were to continue as a strong nation. Therefore, some 10 years ago we started a program designed to maintain and improve our soil resources. That program has been so successful that during the war years, during the last 3 or 4 years, the farmers of the United States have been able to produce one-third more, in the way of food and fiber crops, than they produced from the years 1935 to 1939, when the program was getting under way.

Although we have made a splendid start in maintaining our soil resources, yet all this time we have probably not been keeping pace with the destructive elements which have been working upon the land. Today about 950,000,000 acres of land in the United States need attention if we do not desire to watch it go down the rivers, lose its fertility, and become valueless. That is what makes this program which has been so successful so far so essential for the future. We must continue it if we are to perpetuate ourselves and our Nation.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the mental processes of those who oppose the continuation of a program which is designed to prolong the existence of our lives, both as individuals and as a nation.

Our farm organizations recognize the situation as it is. So far as I know, every one of them is strongly in favor of this program. They know that it is necessary if we are to continue to maintain a strong agriculture in the United States, and if we cannot do that, we never in the world can maintain a strong nation. Both major political parties have recognized the necessity of the program, and both are on record as favoring it.

The work of soil conservation has been done particularly well in my own State of Vermont. It has been done so well, and so much of our poor land has been restored to a great degree of productivity, and the success of the program has been so apparent, that my own State legislature, in both houses, unanimously voted to memorialize Congress to continue the program to the full extent to which it had been carried on in the past.

So, Mr. President, I wish to add my word to those of other Senators who have urged that this most beneficial of all programs be continued. We cannot afford to give it up now, not only because of its importance to the security of our Nation, but because it is so necessary if we are to continue to do our part in bringing peace to all the rest of the world. We know that famine breeds unrest and warfare, and the more we can alleviate famine conditions through the production of our own land the safer the world will be so far as war and peace are concerned.

Mr. President, I cannot urge too strongly that the Senate approve by an overwhelming record vote the motion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the arguments in behalf of insisting on the amendment regarding the soil-conservation program have been well and ably presented. I rise to associate myself with those who have presented the arguments, and who have so strongly stated the case for the continuance of our soil-conservation program. I rise as well to protest against the proposed action which would undermine and destroy this great soil-conservation activity.

Only Saturday evening the Washington Star carried an article by Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, who is the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. We of the Senate know Dr. Bennett. He has devoted his life to the cause of soil conservation. Perhaps no man in America speaks with greater authority on any subject than does Dr. Bennett on the subject of soil conservation, and what it means to the preservation of our Nation and of our American civilization.

Dr. Bennett's article was headed "The land won't wait. More comprehensive soil-conservation practices must be instituted without delay."

The land will not wait, Mr. President.

Dr. Bennett says in the article:

> We cannot afford to postpone the safeguarding of our productive land against further disastrous inroads by erosion. To do so would be costly and exceedingly damaging to the Nation's economy and security.
>
> The land won't wait now, if we neglect it while we busy ourselves with other supposedly more important matters, any more than it waited during the 150 years or so before we started doing something to keep our topsoil from washing down to the sea or blowing halfway across the continent.

The land is not waiting, as Dr. Bennett has said. There are more acres of land in the United States today absolutely worthless, of no benefit to our Nation or its people, of no benefit for the production of food or fiber, than the entire acreage of the great State of South Carolina alone.

Dr. Bennett continues:

> Every year's delay in applying complete soil and water conservation treatment brings more ruinous damage to some of our land somewhere.

How true that is. How often we have seen a hillside where the water had washed small gullies, taking off most of the topsoil. We know that through the years that form of destruction has accelerated. Each year takes a larger percentage of the topsoil, until finally there is no topsoil, until we have left only the gullied, worthless hillside.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the same gentleman who furnished the facts that the Senator has been discussing for the last few minutes——

Mr. HILL. Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, the outstanding authority in the United States on the question of soil conservation.

Mr. MURRAY. Discussing the same subject in a previous article, this distinguished gentleman stated the following facts:

> Today there is left in the world, as well as I have been able to estimate it, only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land. That land must feed more than 2,000,000,000 people, whose numbers are increasing at the rate of about 20,000,000 a year. The great bulk of our food comes from this land, as well as all of our wood, leather, wool, cotton, and various other vegetable fibers and oils. Nutritionists tell us it takes about 2½ acres of reasonably productive land, on the average, to provide each person with a minimum adequate diet. Some countries have less than that much now—some less than 1 acre per capita. Whole nations and civilizations in the past have perished because they misused their land.

He proceeds further to give the following facts:

> More than half of our farm land has been damaged by erosion—millions of acres of it ruined for further practical cultivation and other millions of acres almost as seriously affected. Soil-conservation surveys indicate that we have left only about 450,000,000 acres of good cropland in this country, and all but about 100,000,000 acres of this is subject to erosion. Moreover, some 80,000,000 acres of the 450,000,000 still needs clearing, drainage, irrigation, or other improvements to make it productive. Meanwhile, erosion likewise has been taking its soil from a vast acreage of our range and pasture lands.

He proceeds in this article, which appeared in the Washington Star of July 16, 1947, with an array of facts which are startling, proving conclusively what is being said here this afternoon, that the conservation of what remains of our shrinking agricultural lands is the most important problem before the Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for the contribution he has made. He has given the Senate the information from the article by Dr. Bennett which it was my intention to give to the Senate. I am delighted that the Senator from Montana has done so.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his splendid statement about Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, who is a distinguished citizen of North Carolina. Our State is proud of the contribution which Dr. Bennett has made to the permanent welfare of the people of the United States. On June 26, I discussed on the Senate floor somewhat in detail reductions made in the agricultural appropriation bill by the House of Representatives. I now wish to thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the other members of the committee for their effective work in connection with this bill. I also wish to urge the Senate to stand firm in its efforts to preserve the integrity of Congress and to prevent the destruction of the farm program heretofore established. I wish to associate myself with the untiring efforts and statements of the Senator from Alabama and all Members of the Senate who are vitally interested in this most important question.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate. The Senator from Montana has read very pertinent excerpts from the article by Dr. Bennett. I call attention merely to one paragraph in Dr. Bennett's article, in which he is speaking about the results of soil conservation, not only as protecting, preserving and maintaining the soil of the Nation, but as to helping the farmer to increase the production of food and fiber. Dr. Bennett says:

> Earlier, more than 9,000 representative farmers in all parts of the United States reported that conservation farming for 2 years or longer had increased their per acre yields of all major crops by almost 36 percent. These reporting farms totaled nearly 4,000,000 acres. Representative per acre increase included more than 39 percent for corn and nearly 25 percent for tobacco. The total acreages of the more soil-depleting row crops—

We know it is crops like corn, tobacco, and cotton that are so soil depleting—

> consistently were cut down in favor of grass and other protective crops, but the total production of such intertilled crops just as consistently increased. Meanwhile safer land use and better, diversified farming with more livestock and poultry comprised the most important gain of all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Arkansas, because I know how deeply interested he is in this subject. I remember when he and I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives together that we waged a battle in the House, side by side, for soil conservation. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Arkansas. If he were not so young, I should say, the long-time friend of soil conservation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. The Senator is discussing now amendment 42, which is in disagreement. I want to get a little information, if the Senator can give it to me, regarding the proposal to limit payments this year to an amount not to exceed $500 to any one individual. Is that still in the amendment?

Mr. HILL. As I understand, it is still in the amendment, and that amendment is to be voted upon. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it. I hope it will be a yea-and-nay vote and I hope it will be unanimously rejected. That is in the amendment, and, as the Senator knows, the provision in itself is a breach of faith. It is a violation of our promise. It is a breach of the contract with the farmers. One may not contract with another party and then, without consulting him and without obtaining his consent, change the contract, inserting a provision that was not in the contract originally agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is just the point I wanted to raise. If we are under contract for approximately $300,000,000, for which the Agriculture Department was instructed to plan the program this year, then we are certainly under obligation not to limit the benefits to any individual, unless notice or admonition was given of it at the time of the planning of this year's program. I have insisted we ought to keep faith with the farmers this year. If it is a program that we feel we can begin to reduce, then we should indicate on what basis the program ought to be planned for next year.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me to interpose a moment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. We should keep faith, no matter what the cost. We are now beyond any question of cost.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The cost is limited by the program planned.

Mr. HILL. It is certainly limited by the program planned, to which we solemnly committed ourselves. We must keep faith. The Senator perhaps heard the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] call attention to the fact that the Government paid out—this same United States Government, now that proposes to breach its contract and to breach its faith—the United States Government paid out $6,500,000,000 to American industry, to protect and to save harmless American industry from losses as the result of reconversion following the war. We pay today $6,500,000,000 to American industry. If we were to spend $300,000,000 for the soil-conservation program the sum of $6,500,000,000 would carry on that program for more than 20 years. Yet we quibble, dawdle, and delay. We talk about breaching our contract now by failing to provide for the continuance for 1 year of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make the observation that I believe the program is one which should be reconsidered and reexamined from time to time. Having made the commitment, however, I cannot bring myself to break the contract, because it is a contract just as truly as any other Government contract which may have been executed. I shall vote, and I hope the final outcome will be to pay the farmers in full on the program as planned for the present year. Mr. President, I am anxious that the program be continued, even though it may be curtailed to the extent indicated by the Senate amendment, even to $150,000,000 for the next year. I do not think we ought to stop the program abruptly. It has done too much good to be stopped. It would be an unwise policy to do so. We are hoping, of course, that in a few years the farmers will be able to handle the matter alone, without Government assistance, but until then the program should not be wrecked.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for the contribution he has made. He has voiced the sentiments which I was trying to express, that there should be no breach of the promise we have made. We should keep faith with the farmers and carry out to the letter the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I have an article published in the Montgomery Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala., telling of a survey which was made in Crenshaw County, Ala., and describing all the benefits to the farmers of the soil-conservation program. In addition to the many benefits to the land, the survey showed that for every dollar the Government put into the program the farmer received a return of about $16. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, to return for a moment, if I may, to the article written by Dr. Bennett, I call attention to one paragraph. We are speaking of the farmer today. We must not forget that what affects the farmer affects the economy of the whole community. It affects the economy and welfare of every man, woman, and child in the country. Dr. Bennett very aptly said:

> The typical American community—except for certain industrial centers—depends on the farms or ranches around it for its business prosperity. Such improved income as I have referred to means better living for the farmer and better business for manufacturers and merchants, bankers, doctors, lawyers, newspapers, labor, everybody. It means better schools and more support for teachers. And that chain of increased wealth likewise extends to increased tax revenues to Government.

In other words, Mr. President, we could not be dealing with any subject today more fundamental to the life of our Nation, or with any subject which more vitally affects the whole economy of all the people of the United States, than the question of agriculture and of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate further except to say that today, through cropping, leaching, and erosion more than twice as much plant food is being taken out of the soil of the United States as is being put back. An individual who draws twice as much out of his bank account as he puts in will soon face bankruptcy. The trend in the country today is toward soil bankruptcy. In other words, if we continue to proceed as we are now in the removal of plant food from the soil of the United States we will face soil bankruptcy.

Mr. President, there are just two forces which destroy nations and civilization. One is an invading army. The other is the destruction of the soil. We are spending, as I believe we should be spending, billions of dollars for our national defense, in order to keep ourselves strong from a military standpoint. Surely we should spend what is relatively almost a pittance to maintain the fertility of our soil and the strengthening of our national economy.

We talk much today about the atomic bomb, and we are frightened by the thought of the atomic bomb. We know that our Nation and our civilization could be destroyed by the atomic bomb. But, Mr. President, our Nation and our civilization will be destroyed just as surely, albeit a bit more slowly, if we do not preserve our soil. I protest this effort to destroy our soil-conservation program, it is a wasteful, a destructive effort, and I urge the Senate to stand fast by these amendments. I urge that a yea-and-nay vote be taken, and that the Senate vote unanimously to stand by the soil-conservation program.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of June 11, 1947]

CRENSHAW SOIL CONSERVATION RETURNS $16 FOR $1 TO UNITED STATES

(By Rachel Lightfoot)

LUVERNE, ALA., June 10.—Crenshaw County farmer committeemen, Willie L. Slaughter, chairman; Eustace E. Rhodes, vice chairman; and O. D. Martin, member, and PMA workers recently set out to answer the question: Are AAA soil-building payments to farmers a sound investment for the Government to make? Their purpose was to determine the return per dollar invested by the Government in each of the soil-building practices being carried out in the county.

Meeting with the farmer committeemen were: J. M. Sasser, country administrative officer; J. A. McLeod, county agent; J. K. Keller, Soil Conservation Service representative; and, M. L. Reddoch of FHA.

In making this analysis, both farmers and agricultural workers were consulted. The following things figured in evaluation of the Government's investment in conservation through AAA practices: Application per acre, price per ton of materials, yield per acre, increased yield per acre, experimental result figures, estimated life of results from practice, and what farmers said their results were.

Using these points to figure the value of the practices, the group obtained these soil-building values: Winter legumes, permanent pasture, and sericea lespedeza, $30 per acre; kudza, $25 an acre; 18 percent phosphate, $25 per ton; agricultural limestone, $15 per ton; basic slag, $20 per ton; 100 feet terraces, $3; and 100 feet of drainage ditches, $100.

In Crenshaw County, the PMA to date this year has spent $49,251.22 and farmers have spent $14,700 in establishing winter legumes, permanent pasture, sericea lespedeza and kudza; in applying agricultural limestone, basic slag and superphosphate; in constructing terraces and drainage ditches. Under PMA the cost of carrying out soil-building practices is shared jointly by the Government and the farmer.

The total value of these practices is estimated at $795,900. This, compared with a Government investment of $49,251.22, shows a return of $16 for every dollar the Government has invested in Crenshaw County this year.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to the statements made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators who have preceded me concerning the soil-conservation amendment. There are several amendments which are in disagreement between the Senate and the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill. As I understand, the amendment now under consideration is amendment No. 42, dealing with soil-conservation payments which apply to most of the 1947 crop-year program and to the 1948 crop-year program. There are other amendments to which I wish to refer while I am on my feet. One of them deals with the National School-Lunch Act, which, like the soil-conservation-payment amendment, is in disagreement between the House and Senate members of the conference committee, and another relates to the REA extension. I do not see the latter amendment on the list of those appearing at this point in the report. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the Senate members of the conference committee receded respecting the REA appropriation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I might explain that we receded on the $25,000,000 provision, but an explanation should be given to the Senate.. It should be explained to the Senate that that was not a part of the Budget request for the loaning authority.

I read from the justification which was presented:

The appropriation of $25,000,000 is required in order to provide sufficient collateral to support the amount to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Administration Act of 1936, as amended. That section provides that:

"No such loan shall be in an amount exceeding 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor."

In accordance with this formula, the Rural Electrification Administration must pledge to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation collateral valued at $1,176.47 in order to borrow $1,000. At the end of the fiscal year 1948, assuming the advance of all funds authorized, it is estimated that the principal amount outstanding to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be approximately $1,043,867,854. The collateral required to support the principal amount outstanding will be $1,228,079,829. The estimated collateral available at that time, assuming an appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948, will be $1,238,291,432.

The House provided that they need not go to the RFC, but might borrow directly from the Treasury, and might put up only 100-percent collateral for whatever money they wanted to borrow. We have merely eliminated the $25,000,000, which was asked for collateral which was no longer needed. We did not reduce the loan authority for which the Budget Bureau asked.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator for a very clear explanation. I am sorry that the committee receded on the $25,000,000 item. However, as I understand, the House receded on the administrative expense item, which was increased from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. The House receded on that question.

Mr. STEWART. I mention that, although it is not the particular amendment which is under consideration at the moment, because I wished to refer to it briefly in the few remarks I shall make. I understand that it will be before the Senate in a few minutes, after the soil-conservation amendment is considered and disposed of.

Mr. President, when the Senate Appropriations Committee restored the cut which the House Appropriations Committee had made in the estimates, particularly with respect to soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program, I, like many other Members of this body, felt very much encouraged. The cut of those three budget estimates, namely, for soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program, was deplored by many of us when the House Appropriations Committee made the cut. But when it was restored by the Senate Committee on Appropriations we felt hopeful that no further effort or fight would have to be made. We felt that the restoration would stay in the bill. So it is with a feeling of very keen disappointment that I learn that the House conferees refuse to agree to the Senate amendments and restore the cuts.

Before the Senate Appropriations Committee made its report, before it concluded its work on these three items, and while the question was still being considered by the committee, I listened with more than ordinary interest to a very fine, well-prepared, and well-thought-out speech which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] delivered in this Chamber. It provoked a great deal of comment among his colleagues. In that speech he called for the restoration of all the money which had been cut from the budget estimate by the House committee. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, almost as if in response to his appeal, within a very short time thereafter restored the cut. So it was with a feeling of considerable disappointment that we learned that the House conferees had refused, upon further consideration at this late date in the present session of the Congress, to restore the cut.

Mr. President, we seem to find money for other purposes; indeed, we seem to find money for purposes which are almost fantastic. We appropriate it and see it expended. Yet we allow the budget

estimate, which of itself was low enough, to be cut with respect to three of the most important items that could possibly be imagined, namely, soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program. In the years that these programs have been in effect each has made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of the interests of the people of the country.

With respect to the soil-conservation amendment, which is under immediate consideration, the cut should be restored. From any standpoint of looking at the question, and however we express our view with respect to it, we cannot afford to let this cut stand. I do not say that merely by way of using a phrase. When I say we cannot afford it, I mean it emphatically. We cannot afford it for many reasons.

Throughout the past 15 years, during which one of the greatest farm-development programs that this or any other country ever saw has been in progress, we have seen farms all over the Nation reclaimed and saved. We have seen farms which produce the food which our Nation consumes or sells to other nations improved and made more and more productive. We have seen wasteland reclaimed, and a new, fertile, productive topsoil placed thereon, as a carpet might be placed over a floor—a productive topsoil which produces, in response to man's efforts, more and more grain. During the past few years we have seen farming developed from an operation of drudgery to one which produces a reasonable amount of contentment and ease. We have seen farm income increased until farming has now become a business in which more and more people take an interest. A man must be encouraged in his efforts by being paid for the work which he does.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, in view of the fact that he comes from the TVA area and is quite familiar with the fertilizer situation, if it is not a fact that soil conservation is even more important at this time than ever before, because of the lack of fertilizer materials, particularly the lack of nitrates and other ingredients employed in the manufacture of fertilizer which have been used to help to build up farms in previous years?

Mr. STEWART. That is true. I was coming to that a little later on. I am glad the Senator interrupted me at this moment. I shall take only a few minutes, but I intended to mention that, for the reason that the production of fertilizer in this country is highly important. The importance of the use of fertilizer is something which this Nation is just now beginning to learn. We are becoming, so to speak, fertilizer-conscious. Nothing is more important than the use of scientifically prepared fertilizer. Realizing its importance, I joined in the introduction of a bill, together with a number of other Senators, which has for its purpose the setting up of a national soil-fertility program, based upon an experimentation of approximately 5 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is so well versed regarding the fertilizer situation that I should like to ask him to enlighten us regarding the nitrate situation. The Senator is well aware of the fact that there is a tremendous shortage of food throughout the world. A considerable quantity of the nitrates produced by TVA during the past year was bought by the Army and shipped overseas for the rebuilding of the countries with the rehabilitation of which America is charged. On the other hand, coming from a seaport city, I know that the enormous imports of Chilean nitrates have declined. Every effort was made this year, through the Maritime Commission and through representatives of the Chilean Nitrate Association, to increase the amount of nitrates, but in spite of that, and because of the increased acreage in this country, there has been a tremendous shortage in the Midwest. I hope the Senator, who is so well informed regarding the situation in the TVA, will speak more about that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may proffer a unanimous-consent request and offer a resolution which I have already called to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed with the immediate consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk regarding the appointment of Robert Flemming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I may have permission, I will withdraw my request and the resolution which I have submitted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the majority leader why he withdraws his request?

Mr. WHITE. Because I found that there was not unanimity of approval of my course of action.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean to say that someone is objecting to the appointment of Robert Fleming?

Mr. WHITE. No; but someone was not enthusiastic about the course of action which I have suggested.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from South Carolina with reference to the shortage of nitrates throughout the country is correct; there has been a serious shortage. We have been shipping nitrates and other fertilizer materials, including phosphate rock, and so forth, to Europe, to Korea, to Spain, and possibly to China, and other foreign countries. Those countries at least have received shipments of fertilizer from the United States. Such shipments have produced a shortage here which has been very serious. It has been claimed that our shipments abroad have not been very much greater in amount than have shipments which have occurred in other years. Whether that is true I do not know, but in this country, there has been brought about a tremendous shortage, largely because of increased demands for fertilizer due to the fact that we have become fertilizer-conscious and are using it more and more all the time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the able Senator from Tennessee that the Appropriations Committee which is now considering the supplemental appropriation bill for relief to foreign countries in the matter of foodstuffs and other articles identified with them, has inserted a provision that wherever possible and practicable articles for foreign relief shall come from those of which there is a surplus in this country and shall be selected so as to aid wherever possible the national economy. While I do not mean to say that that will preclude the purchase of fertilizers which are badly needed here, it does give direction to the purchase of relief supplies for use abroad along lines which I know the Senator from Tennessee has in mind.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have that information. I hope it applies to fertilizer; and I take it that it will. At least the Senator says, as I understand, that the articles shipped abroad must be in surplus supply.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. We do not say "must," because it might be that if we drew it so tightly some article which is not in surplus would have to be included in the shipment, but it is provided that in furnishing these relief supplies they shall be selected so as to aid the national economy wherever possible and shall be taken from surpluses wherever possible and practicable. They could still select things which are in short supply, but they are directed not to do that if they can find any other way to serve the same purpose with articles that are not in short supply.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator. That shows how the committee feels about it. I feel the same way, and I am sure most of the Members of the Senate feel that way. I have discussed the fertilizer shortage privately among Members of this body to such an extent that I feel that the report of the Senator from Maryland will be received with approval.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whether we ship 1 ton of fertilizer or 100,000 tons, or none at all, it would still be in short supply because of the increased acreage the farmers undertook to cultivate in order to win the war and because, during the war period, they suffered from lack of new farm machinery and other essential things. So the point that the Senator and I are trying to make is that, regardless of whether fertilizer is shipped, now as never before the soil conservation program is needed, so that the cover

crops, particularly those which contribute nitrogen to the soil, can be used to build up the soil.

Mr. STEWART. That is absolutely correct. The Senator never made a more nearly 100-percent correct statement in his life. We have increased the cultivated acreage in this country throughout the past few years. We have increased the use of fertilizer because of the educational program in connection with it which has been carried on, and we have therefore created a much larger demand for fertilizer than has ever before been known. The excuse for shipping fertilizer overseas, as I understand, is that it will enable farmers to produce more food over there. I do not know whether that idea is far-sighted. It might be well not only to keep and use the fertilizer here, and thus create an additional market for our own farmers and others who produce the articles which we sell abroad, but also, Mr. President, to enable us to continue our long-range planning in the use of fertilizer. In the past few years we have learned more about the use of fertilizer than we have ever known before. During the committee hearings on the fertilizer bill, it was almost pathetic, to my mind, to hear the testimony of some persons who were opposed to the use of fertilizer because they thought that only rain and sunshine were needed to produce crops.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to call attention to the fact that during the war the farmers were asked by the Government, including the Department of Agriculture and various congressional committees, to plant additional acreage. Most of the crops they planted in accordance with that request were what we know as soil-depleting crops. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. STEWART. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, more tobacco, more cotton, and additional amounts of other soil-depleting crops were planted. Nevertheless, despite that fact, now an attempt is being made to do away with this service, at a time when it is both possible and necessary to plant peas and other nitrogen-restoring crops, cover crops, and others.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the attempt to reduce the appropriation for the soil-conservation program is clear evidence of shortsightedness to an extent that to my mind is utterly appalling. In recent years we have learned many things about the use of fertilizer, things previously unknown by most of our people. In the first place, the farmers have learned of the need of fertilizer. In recent years many of the farmers have learned that if they use fertilizer they can increase the amount of crops they can grow on their farms. Moreover, they have learned that different types of fertilizer are adaptable to different types of soil, and that different types of fertilizer are necessary for different types of crops. One type of fertilizer, they have learned, will produce a minimum effect in a certain soil with a certain crop, while another type of fertilizer will produce a maximum effect under those circumstances. The farmers have also learned that different types of fertilizer will not only increase the amount of crops produced on a given acreage, but will actually accelerate the maturity of the crops, sometimes by 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. President, think what we would have gained if adequate soil conservation had been practiced in the Middle West, where the recent floods have swept so much of the topsoil into the rivers, on a one-way trip to the sea. The damage done by those floods will cost more than the entire cost of the TVA. It is evident that it is necessary to use certain types of fertilizer which accelerate the maturity of corn and other crops, for even after the raging floods swept much of the fine topsoil off the farms and down the Mississippi into the sea, in many cases it would have been possible to plant a crop and, with the use of the proper type of fertilizer, to have had the crop mature in time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the able Senator from Tennessee is discussing what the devastating floods have done to the Middle West, I think it only apropos that I rise to advise him briefly what I personally know of conditions in Illinois, Sangamon, and Mississippi River valleys, where I happen to live. As the Senator has well stated, the floods have already taken millions of tons of fine topsoil from some of the most fertile land in that section of the country, and have carried it into the rivers and down to the sea on a one-way trip, never to return. Had the Congress been farsighted and had the courage to have spent some money in the years gone by, practically all that topsoil could have been saved; and furthermore, it would have been possible to prevent the millions upon millions of dollars of damage which has been done to both crops and personal property belonging to the farmers in that section. Every year we have the same experience. Only a few years ago there was the great flood in the Ohio district. The Senator will well remember the creation of the Disaster Corporation, whereby the Congress immediately appropriated millions upon millions of dollars to take care of the damage that had been done as the result of those high floods. Yet we continue to piddle along, insofar as any protection from floods is concerned.

I do not know whether any Member of Congress yet has introduced proposed legislation to take care of the damage that has been caused by the floods this year, but no doubt such legislation will be introduced. If the farmers whose farms have been destroyed almost overnight because of an act of God are entitled to $100,000,000 of relief from the Congress, the Congress will appropriate it, with all convenient speed. If long ago men of courage and vision could have foreseen the future and then and there provided the money for the building of floodgates and dams, not only would we have saved the topsoil, but, in the long run, we would have saved millions and perhaps billions of dollars to the Government and to the people of the United States. But even today we do not profit by this sad experience, whenever anyone mentions a proposed river-control project, which may cost $250,000,000 or perhaps $500,000,000 in order to harness flood waters, to the end that they shall do no more damage, we immediately encounter opposition in the name of economy.

Mr. STEWART. Nn doubt such projects would have saved this year's crop, which probably already has been washed all the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that we have been discussing the fertilizer situation and in view of the statement the Senator from Maryland made, I should like to read a letter which I have received from a former Government official, Mr. C. C. Smith, formerly connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation, and particularly concerned with European and Asiatic shipments, in connection with both the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Army. So I ask the Senator to yield to me long enough to permit me to read the letter into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I make this request because all Senators should read the letter, for Mr. Smith knows more about cotton, in my judgment, than does any other man.

Mr. Smith's letter reads as follows:

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
*Greenwood, Miss., July 18, 1947.*

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I am writing you with reference to the supply of nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop in the South. I am sure that you are aware of the fact that nitrogen fertilizer and side dressing material are short in South Carolina for the 1947 crop. I believe the following is constructive and offers a possible solution of reasonable nitrogen fertilizer and side dressing supplies for the 1948 crop.

The Army is operating four plants to produce ammonia. These plants are:

1. Cactus Ordnance Plant, Sunray, Tex.
2. Morgantown Ordnance Plant, Morgantown, W. Va.
3. Ohio River Ordnance Plant, Henderson, Ky.
4. Missouri Ordnance Plant, Louisiana, Mo.

I understand these four plants have a rated annual capacity of 407,700 tons of pure nitrogen, or the equivalent of of 1,220,000 tons of ammonium nitrate.

The Army has requirements of 840,000 tons of ammonium nitrate, or its equivelent, to send to Japan, Germany, and the occupied countries. I think the requirements for exports of nitrogen fertilizer to friendly countries amount to about the equivalent of 280,000 tons of ammonium nitrate. If the four plants above produce their rated capacity, they could supply ammonia equivalent to all the nitrogen requirements for this country. This would leave all the United States commercial production of ammonia, ammonium nitrate, synthetic nitrate of soda, etc., for the farmers of the United States.

We are informed that the following Army plants which can grain ammonium nitrate are not running, and we indicate the possible

monthly production of ammonium nitrate of each:

| | Tons ammonium nitrate per month |
|---|---|
| Kingsport, Tenn | 11,500 |
| Terre Haute, Ind | 6,200 |
| Milan, Tenn | 5,000 |
| Defense, Tex.; Doyline, La | 33,700 |
| Total | 33,700 |

All these plants should be placed in production and run to capacity.

We understand the Defense, Tex., and Doyline, La., plants, now leased by Lion Oil Co. and producing ammonium nitrate, are being released shortly to the Army. Certainly these plants should be kept in maximum production by the Army. We understand also the Bureau of Mines has some experimental work at the Louisiana, Mo., ordnance plant, but that this plant can produce an additional 4,700 tons of ammonium nitrate per month.

I realize the Army may have labor troubles, tank-car troubles, etc. These can be overcome if there is a will to do so. It is possible that some of these plants may be higher in costs than others, but it is cheaper to ship fertilizer—even at a high price—and let the occupied areas use their own labor to produce the food than to ship the food from the United States. This may require an examination of the appropriations for producing fertilizer for the occupied areas. The friendly nations pay for the fertilizer, and while such nations want the fertilizer as cheaply as possible, they pay such price as is necessary for the Army to produce it.

If you do not inist that the Army run all these plants to capacity, this country will be short of nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop. This will apply to the cotton, hybrid corn, fruit, vegetable and various other agricultural producers from nearly every part of the United States.

I know you will be very busy before the Congress adjourns late this month, but I do not believe that you can do anything that will be more helpful to the farmers of your State than to secure nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop.

Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the Chamber, because I know he is interested in the question of nitrogen. I wanted to call this letter to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators. There has been a shortage of nitrogen this year. There will be a shortage next year, and the only thing that can replace the nitrogen is the soil-conservation program. Farmers can perhaps plant some forms of crops which will place nitrogen in the soil.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and hope I have not taken too much of his time.

Mr. STEWART. I have enjoyed listening to the Senator read the letter, and to his remarks. I think he has made a fine contribution to the debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been discussing one of the most important questions before this country today and it will be discussed for many years to come, namely, the question of soil-fertility policy. I am wondering if the Senator is going to discuss briefly Senate bill 1251.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I plan to do that. I stated at the outset I would possibly make some reference to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator is going to do that, in view of the fact that the soil-fertility policy is before us. Soil conservation and the lack of proper fertilizers are involved in the amendment we are considering. I thought perhaps the Senator would discuss that bill.

What I wanted to mention about the bill, just briefly—and I cannot say whether or not I will support it—is the fact that men on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans who considered anything but liberal in their views toward the Government going into business, have agreed, under this bill, that the Government should go into the business, at least for a period of 5 years, of making fertilizer in a plant to be established at Mobile, Ala., at a cost to the Government of $10,000,000, and a cost of some ten or fifteen million dollars more to administer the program over the period involved.

Mr. President, to me that is most significant, because most of the Members of the Senate believe seriously in the theory of free enterprise and free economy. During the 14 years I have been a Member of the Senate and of the Congress I have heard my friends on the opposite side of the aisle make one argument after the other against the Government of the United States encroaching upon the system of free enterprise. They have constantly criticized the Government for that very thing. With some of the criticism I have agreed, but I undertake to say that within the short space of time I have been a Member of the Senate I have never seen a bill which goes as far in putting the Government of the United States into business in competition with free enterprise as does Senate bill 1251. I know the Senator from Tennessee is one of the authors of the bill and I am in no way reflecting on him, as being one of the authors, when I make this statement, but I think the Senator generally will agree with my statement.

It is perfectly obvious that those who seek to pass legislation of this kind are certainly reminding the American people of the lack of fertilizers in this country in quantities sufficient to maintain the fertility of the soils. The Senators go a long way, and, as I have said, I do not know whether I shall agree with them or not; I might, I might not, I am not sure about the situation, because, as I have said, the bill puts the Government into business for at least 5 years in a way which seems to me carries some serious objections. However, I do realize the necessity for having more of a program of this kind.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in order to have discussion continue somewhat along the lines pursued by the Senator from Illinois, I shall now discuss the fertilizer bill, since the Senator from Illinois has referred to it.

Senate bill 1251, in which I join the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who introduced it in behalf of himself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. WILSON], was introduced in May last. I was somewhat reluctant to participate in the introduction of the bill. It is a matter which has been discussed for a great many months, as the Senator himself knows. There was brought up, perhaps a year or two ago, very soon after the war ended, an idea similar to this, and so far as I was concerned I then had a natural feeling of restraint.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the able Senator from Tennessee that the late distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, and I introduced, nearly 2 years ago, practically the same bill as the one introduced at this session. Practically the same bill was introduced in the House by the then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative FLANNAGAN, of Virginia.

Mr. STEWART. I did not remember how far back the discussions had extended. I particularly recall the Senator's bill, which would have established a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala., as I recall. At any rate, I approached the idea with as much reluctance as anyone else who might feel that he disliked the thought of Government in business, as the Senator from Illinois has expressed it. There is not a Member of this body—and I say it deliberately and premeditatedly and upon considerable reflection throughout the past year—who dislikes the idea of Government in business more than I do. I dislike to see the Government encroach upon private business interests as much as any man in this body or elsewhere.

Mr. President, I was beginning to comment briefly on Senate bill 1251, and I had just said I very sincerely and earnestly feel that the Government has no right to enter the field of private business. I have said that repeatedly. I think possibly there are men in this body who will agree with me that the best evidence we have ever had of the total failure of the Government in its effort to engage in business arose out of certain of the acts and omissions of the recently deceased OPA. I have seen Government interference, as many other Senators have seen it, in that agency and in others, until I have become absolutely sick of the idea of Government ownership or Government management of any type of business. Yet, just the other day, I read an article in a local newspaper—other Senators no doubt read it—quoting one of the outstandingly active organizations, known as PAC, as having said that it may become necessary in the near future, from an economic standpoint, for the Government to consider the ownership or management of many industries. Since I am on the Senate floor, I shall, of course, refrain from saying exactly what I thought; but I can think what I thought, without being too obvious.

It was a shocking sort of statement to me. I hope the time will never come when we shall have to approach such a proposition as that with seriousness. I mention these things to emphasize the feeling I have when I consider that the time may come when the Government of

the United States should embark upon business enterprises and own and operate the industries, and what not. So I say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, that the fertilizer bill might be an effort to get the Government into business, that I approached it with that same feeling. As I reasoned it, in the first place it is a 5-year program. What is its purpose? Its purpose is to educate farmers on the need and value of fertilizer, the need and value of building up the topsoil, which measures the wealth and the richness of this country as nothing else does. It is a matter of education, and nothing else. Let me emphasize that by repeating a statement I have already made. It was rather pathetic, when certain witnesses appeared before the Agriculture Committee testifying on this particular bill, to hear them say that fertilizer was not essential to the growing of crops and the upbuilding of the land, that all that was needed was work and sunshine and rain. That is the viewpoint of many farmers in certain sections of the country. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that in his section and also in mine, we have been backward in the matter of developing the farm land as it should have been developed. The Senator from Alabama has seen in his State, as I have seen in the western portion of my State, land devoted to the raising of cotton year after year, until the soil has become so depleted that those who cultivate it are no longer able to obtain a livelihood from it. The Senator from South Carolina, whose State until a few years ago was one of the great cotton-producing States, has seen the result of the neglect of the land, until in recent years the pea crop outstrips the cotton crop in dollar value, if my memory serves me right. It has been necessary to get away from the continual planting of a single crop, as the result of which the richness of the soil is depleted until the land will not yield a livelihood to the farmer and to the tenants of the farming living upon the soil.

I remember that on one occasion since I have been in Congress, the Agriculture Department published a bulletin, within the last 7 or 8 years, in the prewar days, giving the total amount in dollars and cents received by the average farm family in different States of the Union. In the State of Alabama it was $85 a year. In my State of Tennessee it was about $90 a year. The Southern States, producing cotton as they have done in the past, year after year, producing one type of crop, have seen their soil become impoverished and carried away. They have seen it going on its one-way trip down the Mississippi River. We have come to appreciate the work done in the last few years in educating the farmers on how to conserve the soil and to build it up to a state of productivity of which we are proud, and to a degree of productivity which enables the farmer to support himself and his family.

As an illustration of the value of fertilizer, there was a community, in a county that is on the Alabama State line, whose soil had been completely worn away; its richness was gone, its productive value destroyed, as the result of continual plantings of cotton, peas, and corn. In that little community there lived about 60 families. They had worn out the soil by repeatedly using it for the same crop, but without the use of fertilizer. They had worn the soil to the point where it almost refused to respond. The bolls of cotton were small. The stalks puny. The return for the work put forth was hardly worth the effort, and finally many of the younger members of the families in the community moved away and sought work in the surrounding towns or in the industrial East. There 10 or 12 years ago, stood dilapidated houses and fallen-down fences.

Finally a forward-looking and well-instructed young farm demonstration agent happened to come to that county and became particularly attracted to this little community. He met some people there in whom he saw something and whom he liked, and he saw the immediate response from them when one day he began timidly to offer suggestions upon what might be done respecting farming. He taught the people the use of fertilizer. They built up their soil. They gave up the one-crop-a-year system. They may still grow some cotton there, but they grow all kinds of crops. The farmers built up the soil in the community and thereby built up the community itself. The soil now produces as abundantly as almost any soil in that section, and that represents pretty good production. The homes have been painted and the fences rebuilt. A church has been built. Everything seems to have taken on a new sparkle, and there is great enthusiasm and interest among the people. More than half the farmers of the community have paid income taxes within the past few years. That is one thing that the movement for free fertilizer did in my State.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of putting the Government into the fertilizer business or any other kind of business. I abhor such a thing. The bill provides for a 5-year plan. It provides for the building of a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala., which is in close proximity to the natural deposits of phosphate in Florida, and close to waterways on which it can be hauled by barge much more cheaply than by rail or otherwise. As I stated, it would be close to the natural deposits of phosphate of which it would make use. There might perhaps be another pilot plant built in the Middle West or at some other point. The program is purely an educational one. It provides that free demonstration may be had on not to exceed 2 percent of the farms in any one county. The farmers are to be selected by a local committee, through the university extension service of the land-grant colleges. No one is to profit by it. It is simply for taking the demonstration to these small farmers and letting them actually see how the program operates and see with their own eyes what the use of fertilizer will do when it is applied to corn, potatoes, cotton, or any other crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have heard the explanation given by the Senator from Tennessee of the program being carried on in the South. I was glad to hear his description of farming in the South. I think a great many people do not understand exactly how crops are grown. For example, some may think that cotton grows without any effort on the part of the cotton grower. If they were to study the growing of cotton in the South, they would find, as the Senator has told us, that many farmers in the South have tried to raise cotton year after year on the same piece of land, without rotating crops. The result has been that in a great many instances the farmers have been obliged to discontinue the production of cotton. The same is true of watermelons. Many Senators have bought watermelons. Some watermelons may look very good, but when they are cut open they are found to be lacking in sweetness. Why is that so? It is because the farmers have tried to grow watermelons on the same piece of land year after year, without any crop rotation. The farmers have now found that to grow the best watermelons other crops must be rotated on the land, because if watermelons only are grown on a piece of land, they will soon lack sweetness.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me on that point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I myself bought such a watermelon the other day, and am now glad to know what the trouble with it was.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the watermelon was not sweet, it was probably due to the fact that there was no rotation of crops on the piece of land on which the watermelon was grown. Those who have bought watermelons which were sweet may know that the producer knew the proper way to produce watermelons. What is true of watermelons, of course, is true of all other crops. The provision of the bill we are now discussing does not, in my opinion, go far enough. The people of the United States have just begun to be educated along the lines of proper agriculture. If the program now in operation should be cut off, not only the farmers but the people of the Nation as a whole, will suffer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so I may ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when a watermelon is grown on depleted soil, soil from which most of the top is gone, in which real plant food no longer exists, the melons not only lacks the sweetness which gives to it a delightful and delicious taste, but it lacks nutrition. It lacks the minerals which should be in the watermelon to give it food value for the proper growth and sustenance of the body. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that there are many doctors and scientists who believe that one reason why there is today such a rapid increase in many

diseases is that our soil has been depleted of certain minerals, of certain plant food content, and therefore our bodies are not receiving the minerals, the food they need. As a result of the lack of proper plant food the human body develops certain diseases.

The people of Deaf County, Tex., have little or no caries in the teeth, no decay of their teeth. Why? Because the soil of that county contains the minerals which when taken into the body prevent decay in teeth.

Mr. President, we know something about the remarkable mules raised in Missouri.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so I may make a correction in the statement of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that the county in question is Deaf Smith County.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to be corrected. It is true, is it not, that the people of that county, by reason of the minerals contained in its soil, do not suffer from tooth decay?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is true.

Mr. HILL. We know that Missouri has contributed much to the production of mules. We know what Kentucky has contributed in the way of fine horses. The State of Tennessee also produces fine mules and horses. The reason is the plant food contained in the soil of those States. That illustrates the need for the proper topsoil and the proper fertilizers which provide the needed minerals for animals and human beings. Does not the Senator from South Carolina agree that my statement is true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. So proper care of the soil is fundamental to the life and happiness of our Nation. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's statements are entirely correct. To prove what it has meant to my State, in the past 10 or 15 years the farmers there have gradually gotten away from cotton, until today they make as much from tobacco as they did from cotton 10 years ago. Furthermore, the farmers of my State have engaged in peach growing. They have found that certain soil close to the Piedmont region of my State is well adapted for the production of the finest of peaches, firm peaches that can stand shipment. This is no reflection on the State of Georgia, but last year Spartanburg County, S. C., alone shipped almost the same number of carloads of peaches as were shipped by the entire State of Georgia.

I mention that fact to show the value of diversification. A study should be made of our soil. No one knows what can be done with it. It is there for us. God gave it to us. If we do not protect it, and if we permit it to be washed away, we shall suffer from such neglect.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his very fine contribution. I also thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his contributions and observations. He particularly pointed out that the finest horses in America, or anywhere on earth, are grown in Kentucky and Tennessee. That is by reason of the fact that we have limestone and bluegrass. The limestone produces the bluegrass, and the bluegrass, in turn, produces the best horses on the face of the earth. So Nature has shown us the way. Nature has given us an idea of what it means to put in to the soil fertilizer which has nutritive value.

The bill provides, among other things, for the establishment of a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala. It provides for a 5-year program. At the end of 5 years the pilot plant will be sold to private industry. That provision shows the good faith of those of us who sponsor the bill. We do not want the Government in business. If we can get the bill out of committee, I proposed to offer an amendment further to clinch the purpose of keeping the Government out of business—fertilizer or otherwise. I propose to offer an amendment that if no private purchaser appears at the end of the 5-year period, when the plant is to be offered for sale, it shall be turned over to the War Department and held in stand-by condition, or used by that Department. A fertilizer plant can be converted into a munitions plant almost overnight.

The bill further provides that the United States Department of Agriculture shall be charged with the enforcement of its provisions. I do not see why all the private fertilizer concerns of the country are not 100 percent behind the bill. It is purely an educational program. At the end of 5 years there would be built up a fertilizer market which would be far beyond the ability of the fertilizer industry to supply.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator have any feeling that this kind of policy might eventually nationalize the fertilizer industry?

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator Senator mean that it might lead to Government operation of the business?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean the Government taking it over completely.

Mr. STEWART. No. This sort of program could not be carried on by private industry. It could not be successfully carried on by the various States, because State programs would not be uniform. There is not enough money, incentive, or imagination in all the private fertilizer industry to conduct such a program. It is Nation-wide. It applies to every State in the Union.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the bill to which the Senator is referring would be a great boon to the fertilizer industry?

Mr. STEWART. A moment ago I made the remark that within 5 years' time the people would become so educated to the use of fertilizer that the private fertilizer industry would not be able to supply the demand.

Mr. HILL. Is not that shown by the fact that the fertilizer industry has had far greater sales of fertilizer in counties and sections where the TVA has demonstrated the value of high-grade fertilizers?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; that is undoubtedly so.

Mr. HILL. This demonstration has been carried out to show the great value to the owner of the farm of the use of high-grade fertilizer. All the other farmers living in the community, the section, or the State in which such demonstrations are carried on see the benefits. They see what happens as the result of the use of fertilizer, and naturally they are stimulated to buy fertilizer. The largest sales in the fertilizer industry have been in sections and counties where test demonstrations have been carried on.

Mr. STEWART. I have not seen any figures as to the sales of fertilizer in various sections of the country; but there is no question that this program is purely educational. The small farmer, who is himself unable to learn scientific methods of fertilization, can be educated in no better way than by conducting a demonstration almost at his front door, showing him year in and year out throughout the 5 years of the program what the value of fertilizer is when applied to his corn, wheat, potatoes, or whatever crop he grows. The result of this educational program would be to make the country fertilizer conscious to an extent never before known.

Dr. Bennett, the greatest soil conservationist in the country, says that each year sees 500,000 acres of land turned back to nature, turned back to become wilderness, because its top-soil is washed away by soil erosion, and because other things destroy its productive value.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am particularly impressed by Senate bill 1251, not only because of the number of Senators who are sponsoring it, but because it seeks to stop the rapid rate of depletion of soil fertility, which has been accelerated during wartime production, and for other reasons. The depletion of our soil gives me great concern, and causes me to feel alarmed. I am led to believe that perhaps there is something in this kind of a program when I see that the bill is sponsored by such able Senators as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the majority whip [Mr. WHERRY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and my good friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. Certainly it cannot be said that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is a flaming liberal who wants the Government to go into business. I do not believe that the majority whip, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], could be charged with wanting the Government to

go into business in competition with free enterprise.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator cannot charge me with it.

Mr. LUCAS. The distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee [Mr. CAPPER] cannot be charged with that sort of an idea. Neither could my friend from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] be charged with being a New Dealer. Neither could the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be charged with it. I do not think that even the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] could be charged with being a flaming liberal.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The name of my friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is on this bill. He is rated as one of the progressive Senators and has a wonderful record as a progressive. It might be said that he leans a little in that direction at times. But the amazing thing is to find as sponsors of the bill all these other Senators, who have, since they have been in the Senate, continually denounced, condemned, and criticized the Government of the United States for encroaching upon free enterprise and competing with the free economy of the country. The New Deal, so-called—whatever it may be; no one has ever explained it to me, but it has been much talked about—has been charged over and over again with attempting to regiment everyone and take over everything and finally become a dictatorship.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was wondering whether the able Senator from Illinois was addressing his remarks to the able Senator from Tennessee or to the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is receiving the full benefit of the remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for agreeing with me. I think it is very kind of him to overrule——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very magnanimous.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for overruling the apparent point or order made by the Senator from Indiana.

I was merely making a statement. I do not see why my good friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] should be disturbed about this, because I am sure that if the sponsors of the bill had invited him——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Illinois will permit an interruption, let me say that the Senator can be heard much better if he faces the other way.

Mr. LUCAS. I recognize that, but apparently both the Chair and the Senator from Indiana heard me, judging by the remarks they have made. But I can return to my seat, where I belong, under strict parliamentary rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, is that the reason the Chair refused to rule on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the idea.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. The Chair apparently did not hear the Senator from Indiana, either.

I was talking about the distinguished Senators who are the sponsors of the fertilizer bill referred to by the Senator from Tennessee; and it may be that the Senator from Indiana feels a bit slighted because he was not invited to become a sponsor. He comes from a great agricultural section of Indiana. I am sure that if the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had asked the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to become one of the sponsors he would have joined in the introduction of the bill, because we of the Midwest need a great quantity of fertilizer to take care of our rich soil which is gradually being depleted and eroded away.

When I was interrupted by the Senator from Indiana, I think I had just spoken about the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not leave the Chamber.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I was only testing the acoustics.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I thought perhaps he was going to try to convince the Senator from Indiana that he ought to join in the sponsorship of the bill. If that is his mission, I shall be glad to yield what little time I have left for that purpose.

But, in all seriousness, Mr. President, undoubtedly the able Senators who have advocated a certain philosophy in past years must realize the vital importance of this kind of a bill or they would not have permitted their names to go on a measure which would put the Government of the United States for the next 5 years into direct competition with the fertilizer industry.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I must object to that statement. That could not possibly be true. The reason it could not possibly be true is because the demand is already 10 times as great as the output.

Mr. LUCAS. I may be incorrect about that, and the Senator from Tennessee may be right. The point I am making is this: If it does not put the Government into competition, it does, for the first time in my experience in Congress, and, so far as I know, in the Nation's history, provide for the Government's entering whole heartedly into a program to spend approximately $36,000,000 in such a program. That may be good business. I might eventually be in favor of this program, but at this time I am in doubt. I am only stressing the importance of it because of some of the individuals who are the sponsors of it. I am talking about the Republican Senators who have criticized over and over again any governmental activity competing with private enterprise. They are in the majority now, and are sponsors of this bill which the Senator is so ably discussing. That is the point I wanted to make. I thank the Senator for the time he has yielded to me. I might be with him in the final analysis if the bill is ever brought to a vote.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to hear that. I think we can do a little missionary work with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I always like to talk with missionaries.

Mr. STEWART. It is a missionary bill. It is for the purpose for reaching out and educating those persons who need to know about the value of fertilizer. The great State of Illinois has soil which is extremely high in productivity and in its ability to produce the great crops which are so essential to mankind. Perhaps the Senator's State does not need fertilizer as do those States which are farther South.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the able Senator from Tennessee that I do not take that position at all, because there is not an acre of farm land in America today which could not stand more fertilizer of some kind.

Mr. STEWART. That is just the point. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator, but that is one of the points in this fertilizer program. The use of fertilizer is becoming more and more of a scientific proposition. Different classes of soils require different classes of fertilizers. I am not speaking as an expert; I am speaking as one who has been advised by experts, those who know. There is no doubt that the great State of Illinois, like the great State of Indiana, and the great State of Iowa, and other States which we sometimes refer to as constituting the Nation's "bread basket," have some of the finest soil upon the face of the earth. Those States have attracted farmers from the South in years gone by. They have moved to those States. There are many farmers in Iowa who have gone there from Tennessee because of the fine natural richness of the soil in the State of Iowa. The same is true with respect to other States. There is a fertilizer for each type of soil that needs fertilizer at all; and that applies to practically all soils. There is a lesson to be learned, so the scientists tell us, by every man who sticks a plow into the soil for the purpose of producing foodstuffs for the Nation's use. That is why this bill was introduced. It proposes a national soil-fertility program. There are not sufficient private funds to establish such a program. It is a national responsibility. We put up to the farmers of the Nation the responsibility of seeing that they receive the benefit of scientific knowledge which is available and awaits only an opportunity to be carried to them. It has been stated that $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 would be required to construct a private fertilizer plant, and that $16,000,000 a year would be required to maintain this program. If I thought for a moment that it would put the Federal Government into the fertilizer business, in competition with private industry, I would not support the program. However, the fact is that every ton of fertilizer which would be manufactured by the proposed pilot plant and a dozen others like it, if we had them, would not scratch the surface, so far as the need for fertilizer throughout the Nation is concerned. Under this proposal, authority is also given for the

purchase of fertilizer from private concerns, for the purpose of carrying on this educational program, which will carry the demonstrations of the use of fertilizer into every State of the Union, and eventually into every community—in short, carry it, if I may borrow a phrase from the other side of the aisle, to the grass roots. Mr. President, I like that expression.

I was provoked by the Senator from Illinois into discussing for a little while the fertilizer program, the soil-fertility program provided by this bill. However, I rose to discuss a somewhat kindred subject, namely, whether we shall continue this year to pay the full amount provided in the agricultural appropriation bill, as recommended by the Senate committee for the soil-conservation program, and whether next year, indeed, we shall appropriate any money for that program. I wish to observe that it seems to me we are standing almost upon the threshold of becoming fertilizer conscious, conscious of the importance of maintaining the fertility of our soil; yet it is proposed to cripple the program which would carry out that development; it is proposed to cripple it by refusing to appropriate any money for it in 1948, and even to reduce the appropriation for this year.

A moment ago I quoted Dr. Bennett, who says that each year half a million acres of land go out of production because the topsoil washes away, and thereafter the soil will not produce. Under such circumstances, Mr. President, it will not even yield sufficient foodstuffs for a tenant family to live on, much less to sell at a profit.

Certainly we have a great responsibility to the farmers of America. Many years ago we embarked upon this soil-conservation program. To abandon it now, at a time when the whole world is crying for food, at a time when the breadbasket of the United States, the rich middle section of our country, has literally been gutted by floods and the rich productive portion of that land has been washed away, would be to give evidence of appalling and extreme shortsightedness. So I hope that will not be done. I hope every Member of the Senate will vote to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate to remain steadfast in their insistence that this amount of money shall be appropriated for soil conservation for this year and next year.

ARMY REMOUNT STATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, for a great many years the War Department has been engaged in raising horses, and has used former military reservations as the sites for that program. It is called the Remount Service. I think there have been four remount stations throughout the United States, one at Front Royal, Va.; one at Fort Reno, Okla.; one in Texas, as I recall; and one in either Colorado or Nebraska. The War Department has decided that it has no further use for horses as a major component of the armed services for the Army has become mechanized. So the War Department desires to get rid of these remount stations.

In the last Congress, I introduced a bill providing for the transfer of the Oklahoma military reservation, at that time a remount station, to the Department of Agriculture, and then to direct the Department of Agriculture to subdivide the land, which constitutes approximately 10,000 acres, into small tracts and thereafter to dispose of them to ex-servicemen, under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. During the last Congress the War Department was not willing to approve that bill, and was not certain, so it stated in its report, but that it would have further use for the Fort Reno military reservation, which at that time was a remount station.

But in the present Congress the War Department has gone on record as being through with these remount stations, and has recommended that the Congress enact legislation transferring to the Department of Agriculture the four remount stations, which formerly were military reservations.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill authorizing and directing such transfer. The House bill provides that the Department of Agriculture shall engage in a program of producing horses, not draft horses, but lightweight horses. As I construe the word "lightweight," it means, riding horses, show horses, polo ponies, jumping horses, race horses, Palomino horses, as I believe they are called, and Shetland ponies.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. How can we justify a program for the production of so-called saddle horses, and how can we justify placing that program under the Department of Agriculture, when we might well conduct experimental breeding and management projects in relation to draft horses, swine, and cattle? Personally, for the life of me, I cannot understand how we are justified in carrying on such a program under the Department of Agriculture, now that there is no longer a military need for the remount service.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his contribution. From his statement, I take it that he is opposed to this program. Naturally, from my statement one would be justified in concluding that I, likewise, am opposed to the program.

Mr. President, if it is desired to raise horses in Texas and to experiment with horses for riding purposes and for the purpose of supplying horses for hunt clubs, riding clubs, race horses, trotting horses, show horses, and Shetland ponies, I have no objection, but I do not want that done in my State. There is on the Fort Reno Military Reservation some good land, much of which is now planted to alfalfa. In an average favorable year, it produces from three to five cuttings a year. It is fine bottom land. In addition, there is some upland which is very fine for the production of wheat.

The land on this reservation is adjacent to a highly improved concrete road. At the present time the land is served with a water system, and likewise is served with a natural-gas system and with a high-power electric line. It is ideal for subdivision into small tracts for the benefit of ex-servicemen. In my State there are a large number of ex-servicemen who are disabled in one way or another. Already they have made application for small tracts of land on this reservation, where they can establish a home. For instance, they have applied for 5 acres or perhaps 10 acres, tracts sufficiently large to enable them to build a cottage, to have a garden, and perhaps to have a place to raise a few chickens and perhaps a cow.

They are receiving compensation, and on small tracts such as these, upon which they can obtain Federal loans, they can locate and establish homes in a subdivision ideally situated to serve that class of our unfortunate population.

In the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee reported the bill, which is known as the Case bill. As I have said, it proposed to authorize and direct the War Department to turn the four reservations over to the Agriculture Department. After the Armed Services Committee found that the War Department wanted to get rid of these reservations, and to turn them over to the Agriculture Department, the Armed Services Committee of the House recommended that the bill be referred to the House Committee on Agriculture for study and report. That was done, and the House Committee on Agriculture submitted a report.

I have no objection to the creation of these glorified ranches for the production of horses, but after listening to the eloquent address of the Senator from Tennessee, I am of the opinion that it would be a mistake to try to produce horses anywhere in the United States, or in the world, for that matter, outside the State of Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will add Kentucky to my last remark.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not rise in order to put in any claim for Kentucky. It speaks for itself; therefore it is not necessary for me to emphasize its prominence in the breeding industry. I admit frankly that I know nothing about the Fort Reno situation; I do not know enough about it to vote intelligently on whether it should be turned over to the Agricultural Department for horse breeding purposes, or divided up for agricultural purposes, but I was interested in the description the Senator from Oklahoma gave of the kind of horses which were to be produced there—polo horses, and various kinds of useless animals, according to the Senator's description. But having had some experience, over a long period of years, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in regard to the Remount Service, I wish to call attention to the fact that when we were appropriating money for the Remount Service, at the time of the complete mechanization of the Cavalry, it was for the purpose of encouraging the production of thoroughbred horses. Whether they were to be used for riding purposes in the cavalry, or whether they were to be used for

the pulling of vehicles of war, such as cannon, or wagons, or whatever else they might be used for, the War Department found that it was advantageous to have produced a sort of a panel of thoroughbred horses, from which they could select the horses which were to be in the Remount Service of the Cavalry.

I do not know whether it is correct, as the Senator has indicated, that this Remount Service or similar service would be used for the production of only light saddle horses or race horses. I doubt that very much. The Remount Service has not, as I understand, been designated or equipped for the producing of race horses. But I think that, from an agricultural standpoint and from any other standpoint, where the use of horse flesh is desirable, the thoroughbred horse has his place, and has had a place not only in the past in the Cavalry, but the thoroughbred horse has his place as a superior animal in any function which horses are expected to serve.

While, as I have said, I know nothing about this particular matter, I would not want the impression to be created that the thoroughbred horse, the production of which constituted the program of the remount service of the Army, is not a superior horse wherever you put him, whether you ride him or drive him, or hitch him to a wagon, or whether you hitch him to a gun, or cannon, or anything else. He is a superior animal, and he works well anywhere he is put. I know of no reason why the breed of horses should be deteriorated in this country merely because the remount service of the Army no longer exists or because the cavalry, as it used to be known, has been mechanized.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this differentiation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky, and I do not disagree with him in any particular, but I shall state the facts as reported by the War Department. In their report on the bill just mentioned the War Department states that the need for horses in military operations has virtually disappeared. Further on in the report the Department states that it cannot justify the expense of maintaining these four remount stations. It costs about $2,500,000 to maintain them. So the War Department is getting out of the horse-producing business and is turning the lands over to any other activity that wants them and can get them from the Congress. The Senator from Kentucky made a rather light reference, as I understood, to the designation of the kind of horses to be produced by this new Federal activity.

The bill now being considered by the Senate recites that it is directed to the "improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States."

In the next line it defines the kind of horses to be produced, and this is the language used in the bill, "for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise." So, Mr. President, it is proposed to produce show horses, horses to be exhibited at fairs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator has just read, they are to be used as show animals at fairs and for exhibit. The fact of the matter is that now all kinds of breeds are shown in fairs and in exhibits. Insofar as developing a breed of horse is concerned, whether it be saddle or harness horses, any of the lighter breeds, it might be even a quarter horse, I say there is an ample number of breeders throughout the Nation, in addition to the experiment stations, in the various States, which are carrying on that type of breeding, or research, we will call it, or experimental work.

Again I would say that, in my opinion, a bill which would propose to transfer this activity from the military, or the Army, to the Department of Agriculture, and continue that expense, is not good legislation. I just read in one of our State papers that a man flew a mare from Egypt to the State of Minnesota, an animal that cost him $10,000. If he cared to do that and could afford to do it, and finds it profitable to do it—and I know the gentleman would not be so engaged unless it were profitable—for the life of me I cannot see that the Congress should appropriate any Federal funds to carry on such research or such activities in the breeding of one specific type of horse.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I again thank the Senator for his contribution. I repeat that I have no objection to the transfer of the reservations in the other States to the Department of Agriculture, if the Senators and the Representatives from those States want the transfers made for the purpose of producing race horses, riding horses, hunting horses, Palominos, and Shetland ponies, but those are all light-weight horses; they are not draft horses. The bill provides the Department cannot go into the breeding of draft horses. They are producing horses for show purposes, or to be run in races.

If I were a cartoonist I would have a cartoon produced tomorrow morning showing Uncle Sam having a horse entered in the golden-cup race in New York, or perhaps at Pimlico, or some of the race courses around Washington. I would show Uncle Sam participating in all sorts of horse activities. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. President, I do not want that to happen in my State. In preference to the production of horses and taking care of horses, I would have the Government take care of ex-servicemen in the State of Oklahoma. As I have said, there is an ideal place there for a subdivision, a tract containing in the neighborhood of 10,000 acres of as good land as could be found in my State, already equipped with a water system, natural gas, and good roads. The land will produce alfalfa, wheat, corn, anything that will grow in Oklahoma. I want to see that land in my State turned over to the Agriculture Department, because this matter is handled by the Agriculture Department under the Farmers Home Administration, to subdivide the land into tracts of suitable size, and to make such tracts available to ex-servicemen not only of my State but of the country, for whom it would be an attractive place for a home. It would be something that would set a precedent to be followed by other States, in the way of taking care of disabled soldiers especially, as well as other soldiers.

The bill to which I refer was introduced in the Senate, was referred to the Committee on the Armed Services, and was reported by that committee. It is now on the calendar. I had a bill pending before the same committee, which is related to the Fort Reno Reservation. The War Department reported that they had no objection to the transfer to the Agriculture Department; so they are out of the picture. The committee referred my bill to the Department of Justice, because the Department of Justice has, on a corner of this reservation, a modern Federal reformatory for youthful offenders. When the bill was referred to the Department of Justice, the Attorney General suggested he would like to have a little more land immediately adjacent to the Federal reformatory, to be added to the reformatory, so as to afford opportunity to the inmates of Fort Reno Reformatory to work out of doors and to produce something worth while. So I have no objection to the Department of Justice taking what land they want from the Fort Reno Reservation and adding it to the Fort Reno Reformatory.

The bill was then referred to the Agricultural Department, and at that time, a month ago, the Agricultural Department was in accord with the program. The original bill provided for the separation of the land or the dividing of the land into family sized units; of the better land, say, to give a soldier 80 acres; of the poorer land, to give him, perhaps, 120 or 160 acres. But when the bill finally went to the Department for a report, the Department suggested they should have a leeway to divide the land into still smaller units. So I took the two recommendations of the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture and embodied them in an amendment pertaining only to the Fort Reno Reservation, first, giving the land that the Department of Justice wants to the Department of Justice for the reformatory and, second, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to subdivide the tracts into smaller areas, so they could accommodate more soldiers.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Oregon, who reported the bill. On one or two occasions the bill has been called up, but passed over. I am trying to work out a program for the best interests of the country, but I think in my State the best interests of the country and the best interests of the public and of the ex-servicemen especially would be served by permitting them to subdivide the land for the use of veterans, instead of devoting the particular tract to the breeding of horses for a class of people who are able to buy their horses, or are able to go into that business themselves, if they want to.

Mr. President, at this point, in order to carry out the suggestion I have been trying to make, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a simple Senate resolution. I ask unanimous

consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with my remarks, and that it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 155), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was ordered to lie on the table, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending on the Senate Calendar H. R. 3484 (Calendar No. 365) being a bill proposing "to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture"; and

Whereas said bill proposes to transfer title to some four military reservations to the Department of Agriculture for the express purpose, as stated in the bill, the "improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States"; and

Whereas it is provided in said bill that the horses shall be used "in fairs, shows, and other events or otherwise"; and

Whereas the War Department in reporting on the said bill stated "that the need for horses in military operations had virtually disappeared", and, further, that the maintenance of the horse-breeding program has become an expense which they do not feel can be justified or defended"; and

Whereas the report submitted by the House on said bill states that the maintenance of said remount stations for horse-breeding purposes cost the Government in the 1947 fiscal year the sum of $2,177,225; and

Whereas the Agriculture Department reports that it will be necessary to have an annual appropriation of about $850,000 for the operation of the said Remount Service as provided in the said bill; and

Whereas after the Committee on the Armed Services in the House of Representatives had made a favorable report on the said bill (H. R. 3484), requested the House Committee on Agriculture to give consideration and to submit a report upon the program outlined in the said bill; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate Committee on Armed Services a bill (S. 718) proposing to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer the Fort Reno Military Reservation, heretofore having been used as a remount station, to the Department of Agriculture, and, further, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to subdivide the land embraced within the said Fort Reno Military Reservation into proper sized units and to thereafter dispose of such land units to ex-servicemen under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (50 Stat. 522, 60 Stat. 1062); and

Whereas the Secretary of War reported to the Senate Committee on Armed Services that it had no objection to the enactment of the said bill (S. 718); and

Whereas the Department of Justice reported to said committee on the said bill (S. 718) that such Department was in need and desired to acquire a portion of the said Fort Reno military reservation for use in connection with the Federal reformatory now located and being operated on a portion of such reservation; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture reported on said bill (S. 718) urging an amendment to the effect that the lands instead of being divided into large tracts should be subdivided into small acreage lots to better accommodate disabled soldiers by making available an additional number of such home sites; and

Whereas when the said reports were submitted to the said Senate Committee on Armed Services such recommendations were embodied in a single amendment and such amendment, embracing the recommendations of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Agriculture, is now pending in the Senate as an amendment to the said H. R. 3484; and

Whereas the Secretary of War having reported that the War Department has no further use for the lands embraced in the several military reservations and, further, in view of the fact that the Agriculture Department is to receive such lands and to make use of same: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate,* That prior to the passage of said bill H. R. 3484, it be ordered referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture for consideration and report upon the advisability of entering upon a program for "the breeding and production of light horses for use in fairs, shows and other events or otherwise", which means the breeding and production of riding, polo, show, running, trotting and jumping horses for show and recreational purposes instead of using the land for homes and farms of ex-servicemen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is proper at this point in the RECORD to file a reply to the statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma, because I think the point should be made that the Armed Services Committee, by unanimous vote, opposes the position taken by the Senator from Oklahoma in regard to his bill and, I think, for very adequate reasons. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the Remount Service and the program for transfer of it to the Department of Agriculture. I think the Senate should keep in mind the fact that the remount stations, or breeding farms, have been built up over the years, and there is a substantial Federal investment in the remount stations. There are a great many farmers, and, may, I say, primarily farmers and stock raisers in this country, who have come to rely upon the program of the remount stations. As my file will disclose, these stock raisers throughout the country are very much concerned about the danger of a liquidation of this Government program. Of course, in essence what the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing is that insofar as the Oklahoma station is concerned it be liquidated. That station is the most important and the most substantial of all the remount stations in the country. The Senator speaks in regard to a veterans program. May I say that there are a great many veterans who are very much interested in the continuance of the remount service.

This is not, as I think it may have been intimated in certain remarks by the Senator from Oklahoma, this is not a program devised for recreational purposes or pleasure purposes primarily. These remount stations have been very instrumental in changing completely the quality and the type of the American stock horse. Of course, on all of the cattle ranges of the country the stock horse is still a very important working animal. The Federal Government, through this breeding program, has bred up and improved the quality of the American stock horse and light farm horse.

One of the principal functions of the remount service is not only the breeding experiments that are carried on in the stations themselves, but the loaning out of stallions to farmers in all sections of the country. Scattered throughout the country are the many Government remount stallions. I remember that it was a year or year and a half ago that the Senator from Tennessee and I were instrumental—in fact we took the initiative—in having brought to this country, when the time was appropriate, a considerable number of horses that were captured by the American Army, principally Arabian and German thoroughbreds. These horses of great value have been kept for the most part in the Front Royal Remount Station in the State of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The stallions out of this group of imported horses are being scattered throughout the country to the various remount stations, and then to individual farmers who want to keep them on their farms for breeding purposes. So the issue presents itself as to whether we should dispense entirely with the remount service and liquidate the program, or whether the program should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Sometime ago negotiations were entered into between the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture. They worked out a program in a bill which was introduced in the Senate, and a companion bill, in the House. In the Senate bill, we have as cosponsors Senators, may I say, who are familiar with the contributions made by this service to American farmers—the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Daktota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and myself, introducing the bill. The Senators are well aware of the desires and demands of farmers and horsemen for continuation of this program.

Now, let the record be perfectly clear on this next point: At a time prior to an understanding that an attempt would be made to transfer the remount service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, and at a time when the Secretary of Agriculture was under the impression that the whole program was going to be liquidated, the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in regard to his bill. Agriculture Department officials pointed out to me in their letter, which might be interpreted as a then approval of the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma was written before the Department of Agriculture had entered into the negotiations for the transfer of the service. However it is now the position of the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture that they are opposed to the Senator's bill, because they very rightly take the position that if the transfer is to be made, then certainly the Department of Agriculture should not be denied the most important of all the remount stations, and the station which comes the nearest to being a self-sustaining station. The Oklahoma station is the largest and the most important of all the stations, and it is a station which produces an exceedingly large quantity of hay for the servicing of the remount program.

I want to make perfectly clear that when the Secretary of Agriculture first wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate in regard to S. 718, the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], he did not give an unqualified indorsement of the bill. In fact his letter made very clear that he was not giving an endorsement of the bill when the Secretary of Agriculture stated as follows:

In view of the possibility of the transfer of this function to the Department of Agriculture, and since the Department has had no opportunity or occasion to survey the activity or to determine the scope of the program if the function should be transferred, we are unable at this time to make a definite recommendation regarding S. 718. However, it is known that the Fort Reno Reservation is an important unit in the Remount Service, and, we believe, its retention should be given serious consideration.

Later when it was decided that an attempt should be made to pass legislation which would transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Agriculture Department the officials at the Agriculture Department took the position, and rightly so, that if the Department of Agriculture was to assume the responsibility for the Remount Service, then all of the remount stations should be transferred to it, including the one at Fort Reno, Okla.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter addressed to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, by the Secretary of Agriculture, which letter makes clear that even when S. 718 was first presented to him for consideration and when it was then believed that the Remount Service might be liquidated the Secretary of Agriculture did not endorse S. 718.

There being no objection, the letter from Secretary of Agriculture Anderson was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 19, 1947.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request of March 3, 1947, for a report on S. 718, a bill to provide for the disposition of lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation in Canadian County, Okla.

Section 1 of the bill directs the transfer of certain specified lands to the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 2 directs that all of the lands transferred, except the lands to be granted to the city of El Reno, Okla., under section 3, which are suitable for farming purposes, shall be divided into economic family-sized units of not more than 200 and not less than 80 acres, and sold in a manner consistent with the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

The lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation are presently being operated as a remount service depot of the Army in the development of light horses for military purposes, being one of four such depots. These four depots, together with four raea headquarters and a supervisory unit in Washington, comprise the present Army Remount Service.

As you are no doubt aware, there is no provision in the War Department 1948 budget for continuing the Army Remount Service, and there has been some discussion regarding the transfer of this Service to the Department of Agriculture for continuation as a horse breeding program as an aid to agriculture. In fact, bills (H. R. 2868 and S. 1034) were recently introduced to accomplish this.

In view of the possibility of the transfer of this function to the Department of Agriculture, and since the Department has had no opportunity or occasion to survey the activity or to determine the scope of the program if the function should be transferred, we are unable at this time to make a definite recommendation regarding S. 718. However, it is known that the Fort Reno reservation is an important unit in the remount service and, we believe, its retention should be given serious consideration.

In the event that your committee desires to give consideration to such bill at this time, we would like to suggest for your consideration the following matters:

As drafted, the provisions of the bill might make it impossible to sell any of the land described therein to disabled veterans in less than economic family-type units, whereas section 1 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, provides, in part, that loans may be made for the acquisition of less than economic units "to veterans who have pensionable disabilities to enable such veterans to acquire, enlarge, repair, or improve farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans."

Section 2 of the bill contains direct authority for the sale of all lands transferred which are suitable for farming and which can be subdivided into economic family-sized units. Conceivably, some of the lands to which section 2 is applicable may not be suitable for farming or there may be some tracts of land which cannot properly be attached to the economic family-sized units established. Authority should be provided for the disposition of such odd tracts as cannot be disposed of under the pattern of the bill. There may be need for authority to sell some building salvage material separate from the land on which the buildings are located. Such authority is provided in section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act with respect to the subdivision and sale of personal property and economic family-type farm-management units of lands formerly comprising the resettlement projects and projects for rural rehabilitation. Section 43 (d) of that act provides that real and personal property comprising such projects determined by the Secretary not to be suitable for use as family-type farms shall be disposed of at public or private sale at the best price obtainable for cash or for credit with at least 20 percent cash and the balance in five equal annual installments. It would also be helpful in the servicing of credit sales under the act if the other provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, could be made applicable to these lands.

Section 1 (b) (2) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, defines a veteran for the purposes of that act as a person "who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable." The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, defines a veteran as "any person in the active military or naval services of the United States during the present war, or any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions." The bill provides for the preferential disposition of family-sized farms to veterans as defined in the Surplus Property Act for the period from the date of enactment of the bill to and including June 30, 1949. It would be simpler of administration if the definition of veterans in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is used rather than the definition in the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

The foregoing suggestions could be accomplished by the revision of section 2 of the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All lands transferred pursuant to section 1 of this act, except that portion specified in section 3 of this act, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture as expeditiously as possible in a manner consistent with the subject to the terms and conditions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (50 Stat. 522, 60 Stat. 1062), and otherwise administered in accordance with said act: *Provided,* That during the period from the date of the enactment of this act to and including June 30, 1949, all sales of such lands pursuant to the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, shall be only to veterans as defined in section 1 (b) (2) of said act."

Section 43 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, which would be applicable under the foregoing language contains specific authority to make loans to the purchasers if appropriations are made therefor by Congress. The last sentence in section 2 of the bill would therefore be unnecessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
*Secretary.*

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me complete my statement and then I shall be glad to yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture, as I understand, takes the position that we are here dealing with land in Oklahoma which from the standpoint of soil conservation can best be used for the purpose to which it is now being subjected. It should not be broken up into small farms. That part of it which is subject to cultivation can best be used, in the interest of soil conservation, for hay land. It would be a great mistake to cut this land up into small parcels to be used for general farming purposes because in a period of an exceedingly dry spell it would be very damaging to the soil to have it used for small-farming purposes.

If Members of the Senate will take the time to investigate this matter they will find that there are many people in Oklahoma who are familiar with the Fort Reno station who agree with officials in the Department of Agriculture that this land should not be broken up into small farms. Just today I received a letter from a very prominent community leader in El Reno, Okla., who is very much opposed to the attempt which is being made to break up the Fort Reno Remount Station into small farms. The following paragraphs are excerpts from this letter from a prominent citizen of El Reno, who, I am satisfied, is thoroughly familiar with the problems raised in S. 718. He writes as follows:

The local paper, the El Reno American, stated last week that you were investigating

the disposal of Fort Reno Remount Depot. It is gratifying to me that a man like yourself will investigate the merits of the case.

The fact is that nobody in this country who loves the soil or knows anything about farming wants this land plowed up. There are about a thousand acres already plowed which could be sold for $250 per acre. The rest, about 9,000 acres, is the finest native grass in this part of the country. It would be a crime against the future generations to plow up this land. It is sandy, we call it "sugary," and melts like sugar when there is no grass on it. The Government spends millions reclaiming land, and why turn more to waste and allow it to wash down the rivers?

Not more than 50 fair sized farms could be made out of it and not more than 20 firms that would afford a living compared to what a man has in town who draws $250 per month salary.

El Reno wanted the hospital building out there and the chamber of commerce asked Senator THOMAS to help them get it. He said he would provided they helped him parcel out the land to veterans.

If a deal could be made with the Agriculture Department whereby El Reno got the hospital and three or four residences and the Agriculture Department got the rest, it would be a wonderful thing for the future of farming and the future of this county.

I want to repeat Mr. President, that no confusion should be allowed to develop in this debate as to whether or not the Department of Agriculture does or does not approve of S. 718. I have been reliably informed by officials in the Department of Agriculture that they do not approve of S. 718 and one of the main reasons they do not approve of it is they agree that it would be a great mistake from the standpoint of soil conservation to plow up the thousands of acres of the Fort Reno Remount Station for general farm purposes.

Both the War Department and the Department of Agriculture initiated reports on S. 718 before the problem came up transferring the Remount Service. I have learned from each of them that originally there was no serious objection to the provisions of S. 718 if the Remount Service was to be liquidated. However, that was before the Department of Agriculture investigated the nature of the land which S. 718 sought to have transferred and turned into small farms for general farming. The Secretary of Agriculture indicated in his report on S. 718 that if the Remount Service were to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture it should come in its entirety. The Fort Reno depot is considered to be an important segment of the remount program, perhaps the most nearly self-sustaining unit in the program. Furthermore, if the Fort Reno station were liquidated as provided in S. 718, I am told there would be great difficulty in operating the breeking program in the Southwestern States. It seems to me that States from Kansas south probably offer the greater need and justification for a light horse breeding program. The Fort Reno station is thus nearly the most important station in the whole program.

While the two Departments concerned prepared qualified favorable reports on S. 718 before the remount transfer became a factor, both Departments now feel that if the remount program is to be continued it is essential that the four depots now maintained by the War Department be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I understand further, that both Departments indicated this in their formal reports to the committee.

There might be some justification to cutting up this station into family sized farms if the land were suitable for such purposes. However, this land is better suited for pastures and livestock production than it is for plowland. In any event we know it is a good remount station and I feel you should have such a station in the Southwest if we continue this program.

As to the hospital site, I believe this could best be negotiated between the local officials and the Secretary of Agriculture. From my experience they are usually pretty cooperative in leasing or otherwise making available property which is not fully needed if some municipality or other governmental unit has a better use for the property. I have checked to see what the Department's attitude would be and I am assured that there is no reason why an agreement cannot be reached for the use of the hospital building by the city of El Reno. S. 718 is not needed to accomplish that objective.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Oregon how we could justify the recommendation and the enactment of legislation which would transfer a strictly military activity, as the Remount Service was in the days of the cavalry and the artillery horse, to the Department of Agriculture, and then continue the experimental and the breeding activity in a light breed or a saddle-horse type of breed, when there are the other important breeds in the country, such as any of the draft breeds which might be mentioned, and when there is a great cattle industry, which is so important to the economy of our Nation?

Would we likewise be justified in setting up a breeding program which would be comparable in every detail with the various other types of horse breeds as well as the cattle breeds? I feel that if we are to conduct such an activity simply for the saddle type of horse we should extend it into the other breeds. That is my conviction.

I think we are trying to continue something which is a sort of a fad, and carry it on as a fad, and for the benefit of a few people. I love horses, and I ride, and I should enjoy being able to ride oftener, but I cannot see that we should continue this activity in the Department of Agriculture simply for the sake of those who are interested only in the saddle-horse type.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota is wrong on several points in connection with his remarks. In the first place, I think he is wrong when he takes the position that this has been primarily a military operation or a military service. It has not been that, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, for a considerable number of years, because the cavalry has not played an important part in the American Army for a great many years. Most of the horses which have been developed under the Remount Service for a great many years have not gone into the Army at all. They have gone onto the ranches of the country, and they have been developed for farm use and developed for the benefit of the ranchers of the country. So we are not seeking to continue something which up until now has been solely a part of a military program. It has not been that for a great many years. In fact it never was solely a military service but a dual military and farm service. The Federal Government, acting through the Army, has decided for a good many years, that because of the investment we have in the program this service should be continued for the benefit of the farmers and the horsemen of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. With respect to the remark made by the Senator from Oregon that this is a service which should be continued for the benefit of the rancher or the farmer, the fact of the matter is that the Remount Service was not known to very many farmers throughout the Nation except to those who happened to be near a remount station. When we were on our way to Mexico we had the good fortune of attending a conference at the King Ranch in Texas, and there we saw hundreds of mares with colts at their sides. The King Ranch has conducted a very extensive breeding research activity both as to the quarter horse and as to the harness horse, as well as the type of saddle horse that would be well adapted to the ranch country. In Arizona and other Western States there is extensive horse breeding, and the breeders have in no sense relied upon the Remount Service, as that was, to begin with, strictly a military operation and a military activity. As we swung from the horse to the mechanized military activity, the horse Remount Service continued to operate, but was the forgotten arm, it might be said, of the military activity until someone called attention to the fact that we were spending much money for the Remount Service when we no longer used the horse either for the cavalry or the artillery.

Mr. MORSE. I never like to argue over a question of fact, because facts are so easy to determine. I wish to point out that the Senator from Minnesota is simply wrong on his facts. For a great many years the Remount Service has located a great many stallions throughout the country on the farms of the country for breeding purposes in the farm communities. They have located those stallions, until only recently, at fees of $10. Recently the fees have been increased to $20. The Federal Government has made available to the farms of the country at those low fees blood lines that could not be made available to our farmers if they were dependent upon such private horse-breeding farms as the Senator from Minnesota has referred to. Why? Because on those farms the stud fees run from $50 up to $500. The stal-

lions are not available to the small farmer and the small rancher because of the high fees. So the Remount Service has been a dual-purpose service of making possible the development of half-breed cavalry horses, making such horses available to the Army when the Army needed them, and also making them available to the farmers of the country, as well as to the stockmen and horsemen of the country. That service has been of outstanding value to our horse breeders.

The fact that the Senator from Minnesota has not familiarized himself with the number of remount stallions which have been located throughout the country over the years, and the use made of them on the part of the farmers, of course, only raises a question of fact as to his knowledge as to whether or not this service has been of value to the farmer. All he has to do is to go into the record of the controversy and he will find the extreme use which the farmers and the stockmen throughout the country have made of the Remount Service. Let us consider, for example, the State of Oklahoma itself. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will find, if he goes among his horsemen, that his horsemen do not at all approve of the liquidation of this great horse-breeding program which the Government has carried on. Letters are beginning to be legion in opposition to this attempt, Mr. President, to liquidate the program.

The Senator from Oklahoma seems to be under the impression that the horsemen and farmers of his State who have and are making use of the Federal Remount Service do not object to his bill. I am satisfied that if he will make adequate inquiry he will find that right in his own State of Oklahoma there is a great deal of opposition to his bill.

He will also discover that in the entire Southwest there is a great deal of opposition to his bill because if the Fort Reno Remount Station is liquidated the horse-breeding industry in the entire Southwest will suffer from the liquidation of this very important remount station.

I can well understand why the Senator from Oklahoma may think that he is performing a service for the city of El Reno by his bill but the city of El Reno is not entitled to any special right in the Fort Reno Remount Station because it belongs to all the people of the country and it should be disposed of in the best interest of the entire country rather than in a manner which may meet the demands of some local group. The fact that the Senator from Oklahoma may not be interested in the continuation of a sound and much-needed horse-breeding program is my justification for the Senate of the United States turning over to a few citizens or to one city in Oklahoma a remount station which is of great importance to farmers and horse breeders in the entire western country and particularly to the farmers, ranchers, and horse breeders in the great Southwest.

I repeat that S. 718 is not necessary in order to secure for the city of El Reno and for the Department of Justice the reformatory and hospital sites which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to accomplish in his bill. I am assured by officials in the Department of Agriculture that once the Fort Reno Remount Station is transferred to the Department of Agriculture satisfactory negotiations can be consummated between the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture in regard to this particular matter.

I submit such a course of action should be followed rather than permit complete liquidation of the Fort Reno Remount Station, which, obviously, is the intent and purpose of S. 718. From the standpoint of soil conservation alone the bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma should be defeated because the record of this case shows that the land within the boundaries of the Fort Reno Remount Station is not suitable for the small farm use.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I am in thorough sympathy and accord with all he has said about the importance of the remount stations. They have meant much to our farmers, and the Government has been putting the horses out, as the Senator said, for a fee of $10, thus improving the strain of horses. If turned over to the Department of Agriculture the horses would not be limited necessarily to cavalry horses or race horses. The Department could develop any breed of horses they thought would be for the good of the country.

Mr. President, I have never visited the remount station in Oklahoma, and am not prepared to challenge the statement of the Senator from Oregon that it is the finest one in the United States. Has the Senator from Oregon visited the remount station at Front Royal in Virginia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I have. My statement is that the Oklahoma station is the largest, has the greatest acreage, and is the nearest to being a self-sustaining station.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall not challenge that statement, but the Senator from Oregon will bear me out when I say that the station at Front Royal is well equipped, from the standpoint of stables and barns and housing facilities; and the 5,000 or more acres of bluegrass country there are very fine for horse-raising purposes.

Mr. MORSE. It is an excellent station.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I will say further to the Senator that last spring the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, visited the Front Royal depot; and after returning he told me that he was very favorably impressed, and that if that depot were turned over to him by the War Department he would take great pleasure in operating it. Am I to understand that the Department of Agriculture does not want to take over any of the remount stations?

Mr. MORSE. The Department of Agriculture wants to take over all of them. The Secretary of Agriculture takes the position, in opposition to the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma, that if the Remount Service is to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture it should be transferred to the Department in its entirety, and that we should not lop off, as the Senator's bill proposes to lop off, the most substantial station of the whole lot, and turn it over, under the Senator's bill, to certain groups in Oklahoma. The question is whether the Secretary of Agriculture should get all the stations and then work out with the Senator from Oklahoma and the Department of Justice—as he is sure can be done—an arrangement as to the use of some of the property by the Department of Justice for hospital and reformatory purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am not familiar with the situation in Oklahoma, but I want to tell the distinguished Senator from Oregon that we do not want the Front Royal station eliminated. We want that station continued, and we would welcome legislation which would make that possible.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Virginia. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With respect to the demand for horses in my State, I think I am fairly familiar with conditions in my State. The farmers in Oklahoma, particularly those raising wheat, have discontinued the use of horses. They are using tractors and other mechanized equipment. It is very unusual to find a team of horses or mules in Okahoma. As soon as the factories are permitted to produce sufficient quantities of mechanized equipment, horses and mules will be found to be still more scarce than they are at the present time.

However, there is a demand in Oklahoma for a certain type of horse. That is the type which cowboys use. We still have some ranches in my State, and the small horse is still used for cowboy riding purposes.

There is also quite a demand in my State for the breed of horses used in the rodeos. I am not in favor of commencing the production of rodeo horses and that character of horses in my State. Those who want that class of animals can procure them from Virginia or from Texas.

Mr. President, this issue did not arise until recently, when the Horse Breeders' Association located in the southwestern part of the United States heard about this bill. They decided that they wanted these lands preserved for the production of horses.

I have no objection to the program in Virginia or the program in Texas, or the program in Nebraska and Colorado, if those programs are desired in those sections. But, so far as the production of horses in my State is concerned, I want to take care of the ex-servicemen in the way they want to be taken care of.

If the Senator from Oregon will yield for one further statement, the Senator dwells upon facts, and I am sure that facts should be governing where they are applicable. During the war the War Department purchased a vast number of horses. It purchased approximately 15,000 and brought them to Fort Reno Military Reservation. Those horses cost, on the average, $168 apiece. When

the War Department was getting out of the horse-production business it had a big sale at Fort Reno, and sold 15,000 horses at an average price of $65. I am not for that kind of business management. If that is to be the activity of the Department of Agriculture, I do not want it to go into that kind of horse-production business.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to say that there is a demand for this station in his own State and throughout the Southwest. Mr. President, I was in the process of covering the points raised by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. He points out, and quite rightly so, that the Department of Agriculture does not carry on breeding experiments in connection with other animals, be they draft horses, cattle, swine, sheep, or what not. That is quite true. But we have no investment at stake in regard to long-established breeding programs in connection with such animals. However, we have a good many million dollars invested in this remount program, which has been built up historically over the years. The horsemen and farmers of the country have come to rely upon it. I do not think it is sound rebuttal to argue that because someone wants to continue a program in which we now have an investment, such a proposal should be opposed because we have never started a similar program in connection with other livestock.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not like to prolong the debate on the question of the Remount Service, but I know of several horse markets, and I happen to know the prices paid for ordinary good draft horses, which will indicate the interest there is in the horse-breeding program. In the past few years I have seen some well-matched young teams sold for $150. For that reason very few men are breeding any type of horse except a light harness horse or a saddle horse. If the Senator and I were to be governed by the investment feature, then we should have to continue the military part of the program and the two-ocean Navy because we happen to have an investment in them.

The Army activity in the Remount Service is a thing of the past, because the tank and the automobile have replaced that type of military activity. Therefore it has come to an end, so to speak. If we transfer it to the Department of Agriculture, we shall be looking for a use for that particular Service, rather than curtailing the activity, selling out, and taking what money there is in the property and the livestock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think there are two obvious weaknesses in the argument advanced by the Senator from Minnesota. The first is that at no time was the Remount Service a program for the breeding of draft horses. It has always been a program for the breeding of saddle animals. Hence, his discussion of draft horses is irrelevant to this debate.

I think the second weakness in his argument is that he has quite overlooked the fact that there is still a great need for saddle horses. He is overlooking the fact that the program has always been a dual-purpose program—first, for the development of cavalry and artillery horses for the Army, and second, for the improvement of the saddle horse for the farmers. They are not pleasure horses. On a stock ranch good saddle horses are essential work animals.

The Senator from Oklahoma refers to the rodeos. The horses which are being developed in connection with our Remount Service are primarily working horses under the saddle for use on the stock ranches of the country. Cattle cannot be herded with tractors, jeeps, or automobiles. That job cannot be mechanized. We shall continue to need a large number of good stock horses so long as we have large ranches.

It seems to me that it is rather important, from the standpoint of preserving the blood lines of our best horses in this country, that we do not throw aside and cast away the great experimentation which has been carried on for many years by our Remount Service. For example, our Remount Service has preserved the blood lines of one of the greatest American breeds of horse—the Morgan horse. What are we to do with the Government-owned Morgan horse farm? Is it proposed to liquidate the Government-operated Morgan farm not located in Vermont?

We have a great deal of money invested in the development of the American Morgan horse. It has been done by the Government; and if it is not continued by the Government the program will be a loss.

Some years ago there was turned over to the Federal Government the Kellogg Arabian farm, which is a part of the Government horse-breeding program. In this country the Arabian horse has been developed to a higher degree than in Arabia itself, through the scientific breeding carried on by our Remount Service.

What are we going to do with it—liquidate it and throw it away? No. I say, Mr. President, we have an investment in the Remount Service which we should continue. The bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] should be defeated. The Remount Service should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I am assured by the Department of Agriculture that it can work out a satisfactory arrangement with the Department of Justice as to the reformation. Thus let the Senator from Oklahoma and the Department of Justice work out through negotiations with the Department of Agriculture a transfer of that part of the Oklahoma station which is needed for the Department of Justice for hospital and reformatory purposes. But the remount station project itself ought to be kept intact in order to help to sustain and support the Remount Service.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain material on the Remount Service bill incorporated in the RECORD at the close of the remarks on the subject which I made a few minutes ago.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., May 20, 1947.*

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your request of April 3, 1947, for a report on S. 1034, which provides for the transfer of the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947.

This Department does not now provide breeding service for any species of farm animals, although animals occasionally are placed with cooperators, through State experiment stations, to obtain breeding data. Transfer of the Remount Service would constitute a precedent in this respect. Several other countries, however, maintain government studs for the improvement of horses as well as other livestock.

There is an increasing demand for light horses for use on farms and ranches and for recreational purposes, and it is desirable that there be a continuing program for the improvement of light horse breeds for such purposes. Such a program will also provide an additional source of income to farmers and ranchers.

The breeders with whom stallions are now placed are permitted to charge a breeding fee not to exceed $20 per service and retain all such fees as part of the cost of maintaining the stallions. It may be that any action to require the return to the Federal Government of any part of the breeding fees or of any increase in breeding fees authorized for the purpose might result in decreased breeding operations and decreased colt crop. Moreover, the costs of collecting and handling any such portions of fees might be prohibitive and the amount collected might be insignificant compared with losses to farmers in replacement of light horses for agricultural purposes. However, serious consideration will be given to possible means of making the program partially self-supporting.

In order to obviate possible difficulties in the administration of this program, it is suggested that the following language changes be made:

Line 6, page 2: Immediately following the words "United States" change the semicolon to a comma and strike the balance of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "the acquisition by purchase in the open market, exchange, hire, or donation of breeding stock and necessary land, buildings, and facilities, the use of horses in the improvement of the supply of horses available in agriculture, the demonstration of the quality and usefulness of horses through participation in and lending for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise, the loan, sale, or hire of animals or animal products through such arrangements and subject to such fees as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to accomplish the purposes of this act, and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary." This change is required to enable this Department effectively to carry out the program contemplated by this act. The last sentence of the present section 2 is not necessary in view of the provisions of 3617, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484), which requires the deposit

of all receipts into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Line 18, page 2: Change "veterinarians in the Medical Corps" to "officers in the Veterinary Corps of the Medical Department." We understand this to be the proper name of the agency referred to.

Line 21, page 2: Strike the last sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof: "Notwithstanding the limitations contained in existing laws, retired officer personnel of the War Department, if employed by the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of this act only, may receive in addition to their retired pay civilian salary to the extent that the total from both sources does not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement."

It is felt that the provision with regard to employment of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is too far reaching and should be limited to officers with experience in the Remount Service, who, of course, would come only from the War Department. The language of the bill, as introduced, and the suggested changes would merely authorize this Department to utilize such retired experienced officer personnel, probably not in excess of 12, as may be required to carry on the program in the Department of Agriculture. No special provision is required for retired enlisted personnel with experience in the Remount Service, as, under present law, they can be employed and receive both civil and military retirement pay.

If this activity is transferred to the Department of Agriculture it is estimated that an annual appropriation of about $850,000 would be required for its operation, including $628,000 for personal services and $222,000 for other objects. It is our understanding that the War Departments estimates total costs of this activity for the fiscal year 1947 at $2,177,225, including $965,275 for civilian personnel, $448,000 for pay and allowances of military personnel, and $763,950 for other objects of expenditure.

Passage of the bill with suggested changes is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD,
*Acting Secretary.*

---

AMERICAN REMOUNT ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: H. R. 3484, covering the transfer of the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, a slightly revised version of Hon. FRANCIS CASE's original bill, H. R. 2868, and your own bill, S. 1034, was recently reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, with the concurrence of the House Agricultural Committee and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. It is believed the bill will pass the House shortly.

Knowing of your interest in the Army Horse Breeding Plan we venture to ask whether you could not find it possible to keep a watchful eye on the bill when it finally reaches the Senate so that it may not be unduly delayed in committee. The time is very short as action by both Houses of Congress must be completed before June 30, to prevent War Department liquidation of the Remount Service.

We feel certain that the many hundreds of breeders, large and small, in the State of Oregon, who for more than a quarter century have depended on remount sires for their supply of horse replacements, will gratefully appreciate any service you feel you can render them in connection with this matter.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Cordially yours,

ALVORD A. CEDERWALD,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

---

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GRAZING SERVICE,
*Burns, Oreg., June 18, 1947.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you for information as to the status of the Remount Service and as to what the organization may be if it is taken over by the Department of Agriculture.

My work here has given me an opportunity of knowing first hand the service that the Remount has rendered to our Oregon stockmen and I surely hope that your fine efforts to continue it will be successful. I went through Remount Training School under Col. E. G. Cullum in the First World War. He was later chief of the Remount Service and is now retired in New Mexico. I commanded the Three Hundred and Fortieth Field Remount Squadron and after the armistice sold many of the American horses to the Allies at the American embarkation center at Lemans.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

KENNETH C. IKELER.

---

BURBANK, CALIF., *June 25, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

On behalf California State Horsemen's Association and our 15,000 individual members permit me to congratulate you upon approval your remount bill per your wire today, and it is our hope that adequate personnel will be provided to assure continuance of the breeding program enjoyed by the people for the past 25 years and now invaluable to the light-horse industry of the United States.

HAMILTON MCCOY,
*President.*

---

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Walla Walla, Wash., April 23, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The agriculture committee of the Walla Walla Chamber of Commerce is extremely interested in the continuance of the remount program, and regrets that the Army has seen fit to announce its withdrawal from that field. We have been advised, however, that you and others have introduced a measure which provides for the continuance of the program under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, and we want you to know that we are in support of that program and hope that it will be successful. There are four remount stallions located in the Walla Walla Valley at the present time, and these have had a great deal to do with improving the stock of horses in this area.

If there is anything we can do to further your participation in this program, please feel free to contact us.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR COX,
*Chairman, Agricultural Committee.*

---

FRENCHGLEN, OREG.,
*April 21, 1947.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been informed that there is a move under way whereby the Army Remount Service is to be discontinued. Heretofore, there was a proposal that they make a transfer from the Army to the Department of Agriculture and that the Department of Agriculture at this time seems to want to bypass the issue. This, as I understand it, would entirely eliminate the Army Remount Service, which, as I see it, would be entirely unfair to our horse breeders of America, due to two reasons:

It would have a tendency to eliminate the breeding of high-class horses, as we may date back to the time before this service was rendered by the Government and consider the type of horses that were being used both commercially and by the Army, as compared to the type of horses we have today.

Also, the expense the breeder has gone to in meeting the requirements of the Army Remount Service for the care of the stallions, together with the investment that the breeder would have in the right type of brood mares and his breeding plant. That he would have to carry on such an operation would certainly be very much of a disappointment as such breeders are depending largely on the continuation of this service.

At any rate, I personally think that the breeders should have a voice as to whether or not the interests they have in the matter should be entirely disposed of by an outright liquidation of the Army Remount Service.

Very truly yours,

J. B. FINE.

---

OREGON TRAIL ASSOCIATION,
*Baker, Oreg., April 19, 1947.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At the meeting of the Baker Cow Horse Association last evening, the directors went on record favoring the transfer of the Remount Service from the Army to the Department of Agriculture, as set forth in your speech before the Congress of the United States on April 2, 1947.

They are particularly anxious to see this service continued and would like very much to have a remount station established in Baker County.

They urge your continued support of Senate bill 1034 and also shall appreciate any assistance you might be able to give us in securing a remount station in this county.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Yours truly,

BAKER COW HORSE ASSOCIATION,
W. A. GILDERSLEEVE, *President.*

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*April 15, 1947.*

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express my interest in S. 1034 to authorize transferring to the Department of Agriculture certain remount depots which the Army no longer needs.

For many years to come our farmers will need good horses and the production of thoroughbreds is likewise a valuable source of income to many farmers. The Department of Agriculture is peculiarly fitted to carry on essential research work in this field as well as to make available to farmers at reasonble prices some of the best blood lines in the country.

I hope therefore that your committee will favorably report S. 1034 at an early date in order that legislative action on the proposed transfer may be accomplished before July 1.

With best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 6, 1947.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Fifteen thousand members of California State Horseman's Association commends your stand championing cause of horse per January 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Fraternity of horsemen recognizes no State limit because you are a practical horseman and a champion what the horse stands for. California horse people are looking to you for leadership in opposing any move to liquidate or impair operation of Army remount program as currently organized and operating. This program is vital to thousands of breeders, owners, and users in Western States. It must be continued. Your assistance and a report of your activities will be appreciated.

Capt. HAMILTON MCCOY,
*President California State Horseman's Association, Burbank, Calif.*

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, that the Senate further insist upon its amendment, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, some time ago, when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] had the floor, he yielded to me and I had an opportunity to express my sentiments in opposition to the proposed reduction by the House of certain conservation payments. For the RECORD, Mr. President, I merely want to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to state that I am in such thorough accord with the position of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the agricultural appropriation bill that I wanted to call the attention of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to the one thing above all others which I hope will not be overlooked, and that is the veterans' program under the so-called Bankhead-Jones law.

A little more than 2 weeks ago, Mr. President, the RFC extension bill was before the Senate, and it was necessary for the conferees of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to give in most reluctantly to those of the House in the matter of abolishing RFC financing of second mortgages in connection with the purchasing of homes by veterans. I might say to the Senator from Illinois that the record will show that a great many of those mortgages were discounted by the smaller banks throughout the rural sections, thus making it possible, by utilizing those funds, for veterans to obtain homes. The Senate had to give in to the House conferees in the abolishment of that section of the RFC Act, or there would have been no RFC at all on July 1. So I sincerely hope, in view of the fact that the agricultural appropriation bill is rather indefinite in time, that the Senator from Illinois and the other distinguished Senators will not give in to the provision of the House bill which prohibits the financing of farm mortgages and farm homes under what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Act.

I also wish to join with other able Senators in the hope that the school-lunch program will be continued, as has been so ably urged by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators. I hope we shall have a record vote on these three all-important questions, which mean so much to the rural life of America.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been in the Congress approximately 12½ years. During that time I have been a member of the Agricultural Committee either of the House of Representatives or of the Senate. Coming directly from the heart of what we call the Corn Belt section of Illinois, it must be obvious to anyone that I would be tremendously interested in any program affecting agriculture. As the owner of farm lands in that section of my State I have from the very beginning taken a keen interest in the program of soil conservation which was given to us in the early days of the Roosevelt administration .

Mr. President, to me it is utterly unbelievable that in view of what history shows with respect to the natural erosion of land, as well as accelerated erosion through the advance of civilization, either branch of the Congress of the United States should utterly fail to recognize the possibilities and the dangers that lie ahead in soil erosion by failing to provide anything in the way of soil conservation payments for the year 1948. It is said by some Members of the Congress, and other persons, that, because of the fact that the farmers of the Nation are financially better off than they have ever been before in their entire history, they do not want this kind of a program.

This program should not be considered in the light of the AAA program. This soil-conservation program means exactly what it says. Under this program we shall not be paying the American farmer for doing nothing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. When he said the farmer is better off, I assume the Senator means the farmer is better off to the extent of a few dollars. But his land is not better off.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. His machinery is not better off.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for correcting me, if I left the wrong impression. I mean to say that today the farmers of the United States have more money deposited in the banks and they have more cash on hand than they have had at any time in the history of agriculture, notwithstanding the taxes and other high costs the farmers have to pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator; but at the same time the farmer cannot convert those dollars into fertilizer, material, farm machinery, or any of the other things which will be needed for the future farms and the future farmers of America. That is what I understood the Senator to talk about, in discussing the program for 1948.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so. However, I am discussing the soil-conservation program as a whole. I state with considerable emphasis that I cannot understand how Members of Congress who are thoroughly acquainted with the soil-conservation program and with the history of land utilization before the inception of that program can even consider writing off the soil-conservation program for 1948.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that the argument has been made that many farmers in the United States are opposed to the soil-conservation program. One of the reasons which is stated is that many of the farmers have their land in proper condition for maximum production, and consequently they believe that the soil-conservation program will result in the Government's paying to them money which they should not rightfully receive. I wish to refute that argument with facts which come from a reliable source. They come from a farm survey which was taken in various congressional districts in the United States. The distinguished chairman of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, Representative TABER, has a number of farmers in his congressional district. The agency which made the survey sent to Mr. TABER's district 267 cards. One hundred and forty-seven cards were returned, which is 55 percent of the total amount sent out.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. When we are discussing this bill on the floor of the Senate, if we are to undertake to discuss certain Members of the House of Representatives, I think the Senate is entitled to know who made the survey and whether it is the same survey which Mr. TABER said was made by the Limestone Association.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it the same one?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I was going to tell the Senate who made the survey. I presume it is a correct survey. If it is not, and if Mr. TABER has answered it in any way or if anyone else wishes to answer, I suppose that will be done. I do not know any member of the Limestone Association.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say that this matter has already been discussed in considerable detail in the proceedings and debates in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not follow the debates in the House, and I do not know about that. Perhaps there are other Senators who have not read that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So regardless of that I shall present the matter at this time.

As I have said, 267 cards were mailed, and 147 were returned. Out of the 147 returned, it was shown that 8.1 percent of the farmers recommended the

discontinuance of the program, 4.8 percent recommended the Budget Bureau cut, and 87.1 percent of the farmers recommended the continuation of the program without any cut.

Into the district of my good Republican friend EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, 413 cards were sent; 48 percent were returned, 2.4 percent of the farmers recommended the discontinuance of the program, 4.4 percent recommended the Budget Bureau cut, 93.2 percent recommended the continuation of the program without any cut.

In Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN's district in Minnesota the number of cards mailed was 463; the number of cards returned, 221, or 47.5 percent of those that were sent out. Of the farmers recommending discontinuance of the program, the chart shows 3½ percent; farmers recommending the Bureau of the Budget's cut, 3.6 percent; and the farmers recommending continuation of the program without any cut whatever, 93.3 percent.

The survey was made by the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., and it was sent, I presume, to every Member of the Senate. I am not sufficiently familiary with the organization to vouch for it. Obviously they are in the business of selling limestone, and therefore they would like to see this program continued. But I doubt very much that any national organization would risk its reputation by sending out information of this kind to United States Senators unless it was authentic information.

In addition to the poll I have quoted I can speak personally about the matter, because I have heard from and talked with a good many farmers in my section of the country about the program. I also interrogated farmers who appeared before the Agriculture Committee recently on other matters, about this very thing. The farmers of the Nation, irrespective of their wealth, irrespective of how they may feel about other matters, have given me to understand that they entered into the program in good faith, and when under the law of the land enacted by the Congress, they understood that the soil-conservation program would continue through 1947 and 1948, they made plans accordingly on their respective farms throughout the Nation. They are expecting Uncle Sam to live up to that obligation. To me that is the most important thing of all, because if the people of the United States, the agricultural population, interested in soil conservation, lose confidence in the Congress of the United States by reason of its failure to carry out a solemn pledge, enacted into law, I can think of nothing worse, because free government can continue only as long as the people have confidence in their representatives. What is needed in these trying times is more faith in the Congress of the United States. The door should always remain open so as to admit greater confidence by the people of the country in the Senate and House of Representatives. To accept the House version of soil conservation is absolutely impossible.

Mr. President, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I helped write the soil-conservation program. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when it was passed. It is an important program. It is a program that under no circumstances can be discontinued—the action of the House of Representatives to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the history of the purposes and accomplishments of the agricultural-conservation program. I go into the history of the program, because I see a movement in this Republican Congress to discontinue for all time to come the soil-conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service.

The basic legislation authorizing the agricultural-conservation program is contained in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936. The purposes of this act as stated in section 7 thereof are, first, preservation and improvement of soil fertility; second, promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; third, diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; fourth, the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and, fifth, reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909 to July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

Mr. President, what surprises me is that the men in the Congress of the United States who represented agricultural districts, men who should have been interested in soil conservation totally failed to offer any constructive legislation to protect the lands of the country from erosion, through the advance of civilization and through natural forces, prior to 1936. It seems unbelievable, when we are fully aware of what is happening every day and when we know what has happened to nations in the past, that the statesmen of yesterday would have failed to recognize the potential power of human destruction in soil erosion.

Mr. President, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was amended by the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938. Section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 contains a statement on the policy of Congress with respect to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. This statement is as follows:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the purpose of conserving national resources, preventing the wasteful use of soil fertility, and of preserving, maintaining, and rebuilding the farm and ranch land resources in the national public interest; to accomplish these purposes through the encouragement of soil-building and soil-conserving crops and practices; to assist in the marketing of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and for export; and to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of such commodities in interstate and foreign commerce through storage of reserve supplies, loans, and marketing quotas, assisting farmers to obtain, insofar as practicable, parity prices for such commodities and parity of income, and assisting consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

Since 1936 the agricultural-conservation program has been in effect in all 48 States. During these years the program has been instrumental in obtaining a tremendous increase in conservation farming. The use of lime has increased from 5,000,000 tons in 1938 to 21,000,000 tons in 1945, a gain of 300 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has been discussing the conservation program. I merely wish to state that the figures respecting lime, as read by the Senator, are eminently correct. The program which has been carried out is appreciated by the farmers, particularly of the Southeast. The distribution of lime through the conservation program has so greatly improved their lands that I do not believe words could describe the beneficial effects to the lands in the entire Southeast, which have always been so short of lime.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his valuable contribution.

The use of phosphate and potash on cover crops, pastures, and grass and legume seedings increased from 400,000 tons in 1938 to 2,400,000 tons in 1945, a gain of 500 percent. Green manure crops to add organic matter to the soil and cover crops to prevent erosion and leaching increased from 11,000,000 acres in 1938 to 18,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 64 percent. Contour farming, one of the most effective methods of controlling erosion on sloping land, increased from 4,500,000 acres in 1938 to 10,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 126 percent. The teaching of farmers how to farm sloping land so as to keep the land from eroding, is one of the most constructive acts which have been accomplished under the soil-conservation program.

Field strip cropping to prevent wind erosion increased from 711,000 acres in 1938 to 6,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 755 percent. The building of stock ponds for range livestock in order to bring about better management of range resources increased from 41,000,000 cubic yards in 1938 to 93,000,000 cubic yards in 1945, a gain of 125 percent.

Mr. President, I have a table showing the extent of certain practices carried out under the agricultural-conservation program for the years 1936 through 1945; also a statement showing, by program

years and fiscal years, the funds available for the agricultural-conservation program. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the tables, which afford much explanation of the program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Selected soil-building and range-building practices carried out, United States 1936–45 agricultural conservation programs*

| Practice | Unit | Program year | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1936 | 1937 | 1938 | 1939 | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 | 1944 | 1945 |
| Application of materials: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Liming materials (basis standard ground limestone). | 1,000 tons | 3,720 | 5,026 | 5,025 | 5,795 | 12,008 | 13,530 | 18,972 | 19,030 | 23,848 | 21,338 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 2,219 | 3,284 | 3,481 | 4,141 | 7,696 | 8,283 | 10,765 | 11,182 | 13,844 | 11,570 |
| Phosphate materials (basis 20 percent $P_2O_5$) | 1,000 tons | 203 | 401 | 397 | 510 | 749 | 909 | 1,073 | 1,873 | 1,949 | 2,401 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 1,468 | 2,570 | 2,993 | 3,837 | 5,746 | 7,077 | 8,002 | 17,063 | 14,957 | 19,606 |
| Mulching | 1,000 tons | 43 | 153 | 335 | 221 | 332 | 278 | 272 | 342 | 205 | 216 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 19 | 66 | 144 | 93 | 134 | 115 | 118 | 266 | 138 | 121 |
| Potash (basis 50 percent $K_2O$) | 1,000 tons | 43 | 62 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 34 | 82 | | 119 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 504 | 833 | 390 | 226 | 296 | 323 | 906 | 3,802 | | 5,496 |
| Gypsum (basis 18 percent sulfur) | 1,000 tons | (1) | 3 | 19 | 27 | 62 | 69 | 94 | 99 | 298 | 594 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 1 | 14 | 96 | 138 | 266 | 413 | 246 | 641 | 724 | 631 |
| Green manure and cover crops | do | 5,773 | 8,010 | 11,143 | 11,627 | 12,064 | 14,494 | 17,343 | 25,322 | 22,948 | 18,970 |
| Erosion control and pasture improvement: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Terracing | 1,000 lineal feet | 292 | 294 | 392 | 355 | 292 | 240 | 224 | 306 | 460 | 280 |
| Do | 1,000 acres | 729 | 1,139 | 1,532 | 1,446 | 1,141 | 1,099 | 899 | 1,092 | 1,723 | 994 |
| Spreader terraces | 1,000 lineal feet | 1,900 | 3,253 | 7,776 | 8,149 | 20,175 | 6,289 | 2,448 | 1,100 | (3) | (3) |
| Contour ridging pasture land | do | | 19,957 | 58,687 | 48,072 | 20,273 | 17,633 | 4,019 | 5,542 | (3) | (3) |
| Contour listing or furrowing | 1,000 acres | 1,293 | 4,754 | 2,207 | 4,054 | 7,814 | 7,414 | 8,075 | 9,811 | 10,361 | 2,323 |
| Contour seeding small grain crops | do | | | 990 | 989 | 1,113 | 1,701 | 1,473 | 2,362 | 4,837 | 7,068 |
| Contour farming intertilled crops | do | | 64 | 4,549 | 6,088 | 7,847 | 8,151 | 9,681 | 12,249 | 13,171 | 10,214 |
| Strip cropping | do | (1) | 375 | 711 | 4,577 | 5,748 | 6,194 | 8,404 | 7,047 | 6,533 | 6,351 |
| Reseeding pasture and range land: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| By deferred grazing | do | 37 | 12,938 | 32,582 | 28,957 | 28,767 | 26,374 | 19,395 | 8,351 | 6,308 | 6,360 |
| Artificial | 1,000 pounds seed | | 195 | 10,366 | 22,796 | 18,132 | 12,847 | 10,138 | 15,822 | 30,465 | 32,982 |
| Seeding permanent pasture mixtures | 1,000 acres | 1,806 | (4) | (4) | 1,030 | 1,940 | 1,713 | 1,489 | 1,526 | 1,626 | 1,507 |
| Protecting summer fallow | do | 3,585 | 9,546 | 7,489 | 8,807 | 7,417 | 8,066 | 14,105 | 10,670 | 12,325 | 14,032 |
| Establishment of fireguards | 1,000 lineal feet | 566 | 13,094 | 18,274 | 17,721 | 27,092 | 38,873 | 59,804 | 79,022 | 62,600 | 43,092 |
| Development of natural watering places | 1,000 cubic feet material moved. | | | 653 | 912 | 1,442 | 1,082 | 609 | 97 | 493 | 630 |
| Dams and reservoirs | 1,000 cubic yards | 5,230 | 31,383 | 41,632 | 49,919 | 64,663 | 52,095 | 43,865 | 49,110 | 127,273 | 94,658 |
| Drilling or digging wells | 1,000 lineal feet | 130 | 166 | 865 | 990 | 1,104 | 805 | 792 | 911 | 1,371 | 1,391 |
| Forestry practices: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planting trees | 1,000 acres | 36 | 44 | 61 | 62 | 145 | 79 | 61 | 43 | | (5) |
| Maintaining trees | do | | 7 | 236 | 346 | 394 | 379 | 177 | 108 | | 33 |
| Improving trees | do | | 46 | 48 | 70 | 105 | 66 | 69 | 35 | | (1) |
| Other practices, harvesting legume and grass seed: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Acreage | do | | | | | | | | 3,119 | 6,356 | 4,108 |
| Production | 1,000 pounds | | | | | | | | | 145 | 109 |
| Grazing land management | 1,000 acres | | | | | | | | 81,192 | 79,780 | 81,432 |

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Included with terracing.
[3] Included with contour listing or furrowing.
[4] Included under a seed classification not shown here.
[5] Acreage not available in all States.

Source: Field Service Branch, February 1947.

*Agricultural conservation program*

| Program years / Fiscal years | 1936 1937 | 1937 1938 | 1938 1939 | 1939 1940 | 1940 1941 | 1941 1942 | 1942 1943 | 1943 1944 | 1944 1945 | 1945 1946 | 1946 1947 | 1947 1948 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Payments (program year): | | | | | | | | | | | | (Budget) |
| Allotment payments | $314,072,000 | $217,762,000 | $351,723,000 | $381,872,000 | $327,881,000 | $334,234,000 | $219,218,000 | $224,709,000 | | | | |
| Practice payments | 60,732,000 | 90,791,000 | 93,919,000 | 117,078,000 | 116,008,000 | 123,960,000 | 168,364,000 | 215,242,000 | $281,367,000 | $220,462,000 | $267,200,000 | $267,200,000 |
| Special payments | | | | | | | | | 12,500,000 | 33,061,000 | 12,500,000 | |
| Total payments | 374,804,000 | 308,553,000 | 445,642,000 | 498,950,000 | 443,889,000 | 458,194,000 | 387,582,000 | 439,951,000 | 293,867,000 | 253,523,000 | 279,700,000 | 267,200,000 |
| Operating expenses (fiscal year): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County associations | 5,699,858 | 28,867,853 | 34,853,054 | 32,382,496 | 25,599,149 | 29,448,356 | 31,862,896 | 17,510,850 | 16,300,000 | 17,519,505 | 20,039,088 | 24,489,088 |
| National and State | 18,825,649 | 15,082,360 | 12,552,966 | 10,926,626 | 11,048,315 | 10,987,500 | 9,784,100 | 8,821,377 | 7,949,968 | 7,352,864 | 8,871,868 | 9,095,868 |
| Total operating expenses | 24,525,507 | 43,950,213 | 47,406,020 | 43,309,122 | 36,647,464 | 40,435,856 | 41,646,996 | 26,332,227 | 24,249,968 | 24,872,369 | 28,910,956 | 33,584,956 |
| Transfers, allotments, and adjustments | +40,670,493 | +77,496,787 | −4,048,020 | +17,290,878 | −14,954,961 | +758,815 | +20,771,004 | −66,283,227 | −15,616,968 | +77,262,631 | +5,635,044 | +935,044 |
| Total appropriations | 440,000,000 | 430,000,000 | 489,000,000 | 559,550,000 | 465,581,503 | 499,388,671 | 450,000,000 | 400,000,000 | 302,500,000 | 355,658,000 | 314,246,000 | 301,720,000 |

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not speak longer on the soil-conservation program. I like to close with this admonition—I for one, shall never agree to any kind of a conference report which does away with soil conservation for 1948. One hundred and fifty million dollars is a small amount to keep soil conservation in existence for that year. Certainly if we yield to the House on this important conference, soil conservation is a dead issue. It will remain so as long as the Republicans are in control of both Houses of Congress.

As I said in the beginning, it is simply impossible for me to understand why, the Republican-controlled House, could for economic reasons—which are false from the foundation up—let the farmers of the Nation down on this soil-conservation program. I am sure the Senate will honor the pledge we made to them in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

## THREATENED STRIKE OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate of the United States and of the country what I believe to be a very critical situation which now is brewing on the Pacific coast. I refer to the threatened strike of the Southern Pacific Railway locomotive engineers, which is scheduled to take place tonight at 6 o'clock Pacific coast time.

In order to give some of the background of this matter, I wish to read into the RECORD a few telegrams which I have received, and which I think show the urgency of the situation.

The first telegram reads as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 20, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Strike of Southern Pacific engineers at critical point in harvesting season would present serious threat to stability of western agriculture, industry, and trade. Loss of perishable crops at this time would adversely affect the economy of this area for the next year or longer. We urge that every means be used to foster peaceful settlement of differences.

C. S. BEESEMYER,
*President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.*

The next telegram is as follows:

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *July 21, 1947.*
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.:*

Alhambra Chamber of Commerce wishes to call your attention to the pending strike of engineers on the Southern Pacific Co. Pacific lines called for 6 p. m. July 21. Request you do all in your power to avert, as this strike will be most disastrous to the economy of southern California as well as all of California in general.

WOODY WADE,
*Manager, Alhambra Chamber of Commerce.*

The next telegram is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Southern Pacific strike Monday, July 21, will seriously curtail operations of hundreds of our member dealers throughout State. Urgently ask your cooperation in obtaining President Truman's intervention to avoid strike.

RALPH A. BROWN,
*Managing Director, Retail Furniture Association of California.*

The next telegram reads as follows:

WHITTIER, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*Senate Office Building,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

You are earnestly urged to do everything possible to prevent the threatened Southern Pacific Railroad strike planned for Monday, July 21. You are fully familiar with the disastrous loss such a strike will entail on our farmers especially, who depend on railroad transportation for removing perishable crops from California.

Very respectfully,
WHITTIER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The next telegram comes from the president of the University of Santa Clara:

SANTA CLARA, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urge that you take step to avert Southern Pacific strike scheduled for Monday evening.

W. C. GIANERA, S. J.,
*President, University of Santa Clara.*

The next telegram reads as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Threatened strike of Southern Pacific engineers would be major calamity to California's perishable crops of fruits and vegetables. Respectfully urge you to do everything possible to avert disruption of service.

LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The next telegram comes from the chancelor of the University of Southern California, one of our leading universities:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:*

Urgently request you to use wour influence to avert pending Southern Pacific strike. Results will be disastrous in this area.

R. B. VON KLEINSMID, *Chancelor.*

The next telegram comes from the Growers Service Co.:

FRESNO, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. Senator W. KNOWLAND,
*Washington, D. C.:*

If proposed strike of Southern Pacific Railroad employees materializes, this valley will not only suffer serious financial losses but public in general will be deprived of lowest price fresh fruits produced in this valley past several years. Peaches now ripening on trees; other commodities ready for harvest. Any action by railroad employees to stop movement of these commodities will definitely cause chaos in this valley. We respectfully urge use your good influence to avert strike, but if strike is not averted, then certainly fresh fruits should have same consideration as milk, hospital supplies, etc. Your personal attention would be appreciated by the signers of this telegram, together with the entire population of San Joaquin Valley.

GROWERS SERVICE CO.

I have received a large number of additional telegrams of a like nature.

Mr. President, in order to give a little of the background of this matter, I wish to read into the RECORD two other telegrams:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 18, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Upon behalf of our membership who pack approximately 80 percent of the canned fruits and vegetables produced in California, we respectfully urge that you and the emergency Mediation Board, which we understand has been today appointed by the President to handle the impending strike of engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad and subsidiary lines. Do everything possible to prevent any interruption of service.

A railroad strike at this time would result in the loss of a tremendous quantity of fresh fruits and vegetables entailing not only great financial loss to thousands of growers and processors but destroying much-needed foodstuffs. Trucks are not available in sufficient number to move the fresh fruits and vegetables to the canneries, as well as the necessary cans, sugar, box shook, and other materials essential to the production of the canned pack. This matter is of vital importance to the canning industry, which is the third largest in the State of California.

CANNERS LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA,
M. A. CLEVENGER,
*Executive Vice President.*

Mr. President, I have a copy of a telegram which was sent to the members of the Oregon Delegation by Mr. E. T. Mercier, of the Southern Pacific Lines. He says:

Your telegram July 20 regarding threatened strike against Southern Pacific-Pacific Lines by locomotive engineers. President Truman created emergency board on Friday, July 18, and Southern Pacific immediately announced it would cooperate fully with the board in its inquiries and its efforts to settle this dispute. Under Railway Labor Act it is provided there shall be no strike for 60 days after appointment of emergency board, yet the Engineers Brotherhood still threatens to strike at 6 p. m. today.

All main points at issue were passed upon by the emergency board created by President Roosevelt in 1945 and Southern Pacific accepted that board's recommendations in their entirey. But the Engineers Brotherhood rejected the recommendations and has continued to do so. Southern Pacific at all times has been ready to meet with Brotherhood officials and to make every reasonable attempt to arrange a just settlement. We are still ready to do so and have been in actual daily conferences with the mediator now here and have given him every possible cooperation in his efforts to effect a settlement. Will continue to exert our best efforts to avert the strike. Prior to setting of present strike date, Southern Pacific in effort to do everything it could to avoid strike and consequent great loss to western agriculture and business, offered further concessions to the Engineers, going far beyond the recommendations of the first emergency board, but the Brotherhood officials have remained obdurate. Their attitude is "all or else."

A. T. MERCIER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator from California would allow me to have inserted at this point the telegrams the Oregon delegation sent yesterday to President Truman and to Mr. Douglass, Chairman of the National Mediation Board, and to Mr. Alvaney Johnson, president of the Locomotive Engineers, and to the president of the Southern Pacific Lines?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should be delighted to have them inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has put into the RECORD information on this subject. The telegrams from the Oregon delegation make perfectly clear to the officials of the Railroad Brotherhood that it is the opinion of the Oregon delegation that there is absolutely no justification whatever for a strike at this time, so long as peaceful procedures are available to the parties to the dispute for the settlement of the dispute. Therefore, as the Senator will see from the telegrams which he has authorized me to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, we asked President Truman to call upon the parties to the dispute to accept either the appointment of an emergency board under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or to accept the appointment of an arbitrator whose decision would be final and binding.

We point out further in our telegrams to the President and to the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the other persons named, that a strike on the Southern Pacific at this time not only would be devastating to the economic life of the Senator's State of California, to Oregon, and to the whole Pacific area, but likewise, if it were allowed to continue for only a few days, would have a very disastrous effect on the economy of the whole country. It is our position that there certainly is no justification for the parties not following the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

Let me say, as the Senator from California knows, my position in this instance is the consistent position I have always taken in labor disputes. I shall

never condone resort to strike action when peaceful procedures are available to labor for the settlement of their disputes. I am glad to join with the Senator from California in a protest against this threatened strike.

I am glad to say, that I was informally told, only a few minutes ago by the White House that the White House does propose, if it has not already done so, to inform the parties that it stands ready to appoint an emergency board, in return for which it has the right to expect a pledge from the parties that they will carry out the real purpose and intent of an emergency board once it is set up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to consent to the contribution by the Senator from Oregon, and thank him for his remarks.

There being no objection the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 20, 1947.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
*The President of the United States,*
*The White House, Washington, D. C.:*

We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon are greatly disturbed over reports being received today by telegraph from Oregon and in the press and over the radio of a threatened strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad system scheduled for tomorrow night. We respectfully beseech you to call upon the officials of both the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Southern Pacific Railroad to agree to a settlement of this dispute by either one of two peaceful procedures authorized by existing law, namely, the appointment by you of an emergency board in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or the appointment by you of an arbitrator subject to the understanding upon the part of the parties to the dispute that the arbitrator's decision should be final and binding. We have sent a wire today to Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, making clear to him that in our opinion a strike of the Locomotive Engineers would be inexcusable and decidedly against the best interest of both the public and workers involved. We need not tell you of the seriousness of this threatened strike to the economic life of the Pacific coast and eventually to the entire Nation. We believe that if you will make perfectly clear to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that you are willing to appoint either an emergency board or an arbitrator for the peaceful settlement of this dispute, their common sense will tell them that such a solution should be accepted. If this strike should come off as scheduled you may be sure that we as Members of the Congress will stand ready to cooperate in whatever way we can with the administration in bringing an end to the strike because on the basis of such information as we possess we do not believe that it is necessary to resort to strike action in order to obtain a fair and equitable settlement of this dispute.

Respectfully yours,

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

---

JULY 20, 1947.

Hon. FRANK P. DOUGLASS,
*Chairman, National Mediation Board,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon have sent the following wires today to President Truman and to Alvaney Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers: To President Truman quote: We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon are greatly disturbed over reports being received today by telegraph from Oregon and in the press and over the radio of a threatened strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad System scheduled for tomorrow night. We respectfully beseech you to call upon the officials of both the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Southern Pacific Railroad to agree to a settlement of this dispute by either one of two peaceful procedures authorized by existing law, namely, the appointment by you of an emergency board in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or the appointment by you of an arbitrator subject to the understanding upon the part of the parties to the dispute that the arbitrator's decision should be final and binding. We have sent a wire today to Alvaney Johnston, Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers making clear to him that in our opinion a strike of the locomotive engineers would be inexcusable and decidedly against the best interest of both the public and workers involved. We need not tell you of the seriousness of this threatened strike to the economic life of the Pacific Coast and eventually to the entire Nation. We believe that if you will make perfectly clear to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that you are willing to appoint either an emergency board or an arbitrator for the peaceful settlement of this dispute their common sense will tell them that such a solution should be accepted. If this strike should come off as scheduled you may be sure that we as Members of the Congress will stand ready to cooperate in whatever way we can with the administration in bringing an end to the strike because on the basis of such information as we possess we do not believe that it is necessary to resort to strike action in order to obtain a fair and equitable settlement of this dispute. Respectfully yours. Unquote.

To Alvanley Johnston quote: We of the congressional delegation from Oregon are greatly disturbed over the telegraphic newspaper and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best inteerst of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and organized labor generally. This is no time for resorting to economic action, we care not what the provocation. Our experience with labor problems in the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration machinery and procedures available to you for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. Domestic economic conditions in this country with their many international implications make it absolutely unthinkable to us that you would call a railroad strike at this time. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or if the parties prefer an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason rather than by the unnecessary and inexcusable use under the circumstances of strike action. We are sure that we need not argue with you our friendly interest in the legitimate rights of organized labor. However, when organized labor, be it the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or any other group, resorts to economic action without exhausting in the first instance all of the peaceful procedures available to them under existing law and reason then we shall always protest such action in the interest of the public welfare. We are also sure that it is unnecessary for us to tell you that we have a high regard for your qualities of industrial statesmanship and for the service that you have rendered the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers over the years in advancing their economic welfare. Therefore, we strongly urge you not to bring discredit upon your fine record by resorting to strike action in this case, especially when we think it is perfectly clear to all concerned, including the public, that here is a case that can and should be settled by the orderly procedures of mediation or arbitration. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have devastated effect on the entire economic life of the West Coast and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action. Unquote.

We respectfully urge that the National Mediation Board make an announcement at once to the American public as to the issues involved in this case and as to the steps which the Board has taken in giving to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers an opportunity to accept peaceful procedures for the settlement of this dispute. We are convinced that as soon as the American people understand what the National Mediation Board has already done in an endeavor to avoid this strike public opinion will make clear immediately that it disapproves of the strike action. Here is a case in which we think the spotlight of publicity should be focussed in an endeavor to get both parties to the dispute to see upon reflection that they owe it to the public as well as to themselves to call off the threatened strike by accepting peaceful procedures under the Railway Labor Act for its settlement.

Regards.

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

---

JULY 20, 1947.

Mr. ALVANLEY JOHNSTON,
*Grand Chief, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building,*
*Cleveland, Ohio:*

Mr. P. O. PETERSON,
*President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Southern Pacific Railway Co., San Francisco, Calif.:*

We of the congressional delegation from Oregon are greatly disturbed over the telegraphic, newspaper, and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and organized labor generally. This is no time for resorting to economic action, we care not what the provocation. Our experience with labor problems in the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration machinery and procedures available to you for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. Domestic economic conditions in this country with their many international implications make it absolutely unthinkable to us that you would call a railroad strike at this time. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or if the parties prefer an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason rather than by the unnecessary and inexcusable use under the circumstances of strike action. We are sure that we need not argue with you our friendly interest in the legitimate rights of organized labor. However, when organized labor, be it the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or any other group, resorts to economic action without exhausting in the first instance all

of the peaceful procedures available to them under existing law and reason then we shall always protest such action in the interest of the public welfare. We are also sure that it is unnecessary for us to tell you that we have a high regard for your qualities of industrial statesmanship and for the service that you have rendered the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers over the years in advancing their economic welfare. Therefore, we strongly urge you not to bring discredit upon your fine record by resorting to strike action in this case, especially when we think it is perfectly clear to all concerned, including the public, that here is a case that can and should be settled by the orderly procedures of mediation or arbitration. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have devastating effect on the entire economic life of the west coast and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action.

Regards,

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

---

JULY 20, 1947.

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
*President, Southern Pacific Railway Co., San Francisco, Calif.:*

We, the congressional delegation from Oregon, are greatly disturbed over telegraphic, newspaper, and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best interests of the locomotive engineers, organized labor generally, and the Southern Pacific Railway Co. and management in general. Our experience with labor problems and the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration procedures available to you both for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. You, as representative of management, have a grave responsibility to urge upon the brotherhood cooperative action in seeking a peaceful solution to this problem which will not imperil the standing of both, resulting in incalculable loss to those upon whom both depend for their livelihood and profits. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or, if the parties prefer, an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have a devastating effect on the entire economic life of the west coast, and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government, acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action. Regards.

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this matter is of vital importance, not only to my State of California, to the State of the Senator from Oregon, and to the State of Washington, but to the entire western area of the United States, which is served by the Southern Pacific lines, one of the large railroad systems of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement, it will not take me more than a few minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think this is a very important matter, because I have been receiving telegrams in regard to the situation, so apparently it is affecting the Middle West. I am glad the Senator from California is making his statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that this afternoon the President of the United States appointed a board, consisting of Col. Grady Lewis, of Washington, D. C.; Leverett Douglas, of Oklahoma City, and Paul A. Dodd, of the University of California.

I was informed also a few minutes ago in a telephone conversation to the Pacific coast that a Mr. Hobart, who is the assistant grand chief, I believe, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, came out of a meeting which is now in progress in the city of San Francisco, and is reported to have said—I hope he is not quoted correctly—"that it would not make any difference what action the President took, they were going ahead with the strike."

Mr. President, I say that no man and no group of men have the right to strangle the economic life of any State or any region, or of the United States. I consider such a strike a matter of absolute irresponsibility on the part of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. It seems to me that they are showing themselves as being unmindful of the responsibility which is in their hands.

I have said before on the floor of the Senate, and I shall say it again, that people, be they in Government, be they in business, or be they in labor organizations, who exercise vast power, must also recognize the fact that with power must go responsibility. Certainly in this case, if the brotherhood carries through with its threat to close down the railway lines, to bring disaster to agriculture and industry on the Pacific coast, it would not be showing a sense of responsibility, but, rather, it would be showing a great sense of irresponsibility.

I say on the floor of the Senate at this time that if this threat to close down the roalroads on the Pacific coast is carried out at 6 o'clock Pacific time, which will be 5 hours from now, I shall do all I can to have the Senate and the Congress delay adjournment. If there are loopholes in the Railway Labor Act which permit this type of irrespnsibility, that act should be modified before the Members of Congress return to their homes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from California in his protest against any strike on the Southern Pacific lines. That road also crosses the State of New Mexico.

It happens that in my State the farmers are ready to engage in harvesting the largest wheat crop the State has ever had. There is a dire shortage of railroad facilities of every kind. As a consequence of that shortage, wheat is being piled on the ground in some of the counties and areas crossed by the Southern Pacific.

I shall not delay the Senate in commenting upon the situation brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from California, except to say to him that his attitude in desiring to have Congress remain in session until it can pass legislation which may be greatly needed in the crisis which may arise, only points up remarks I was making earlier in the day, and which I hope to complete sometime before another day.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and further insist on its amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to occupy a few moments to express my views in regard to the pending motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in regard to the soil-conservation program. I had some experience as a young man on a farm in the matter of wastage of soil, and in addition to my own experience I have devoted some time to the study of the effects of soil erosion in the United States.

Of course, we all know that in the early history of our country, when there was plenty of land, no thought was given to the preservation of the soil or to its reclamation, because it was unnecessary. Our forefathers moved in on the Atlantic seaboard, cleared up a strip of ground, and wore it out, and then moved farther west, cleared up some more land, and wore it out, and moved on again, because there was plenty of new soil to which they could move.

A few years ago I happened to be in New Hampshire for about a month, and I drove around over that beautiful State. It was tragic and pathetic to see the number of abandoned farms that could be found in New Hampshire. I recognize that the soil conditions in New Hampshire and in many other sections of New England, render it difficult for farmers to make much money out of the cultivation of the soil because of the rugged character of the territory, because of the rocks which it is impossible to move. It was frequently desirable to move away and even leave a lovely house unoccupied rather than to remain in it and try to make a living off that soil. I saw many beautiful homes which had been abandoned for years, the yards grown up in weeds and underbrush and vegetation, hiding even the windows, the panes of most of which had been knocked out or had disappeared. I came very near buying one of those abandoned farms in New Hampshire. The house had not been lived in for 7 years. I stood on the front porch of that lovely house and counted seven beautiful lakes in the surrounding territory. I had an ambition to buy it and perhaps spend a summer up there occasionally. It was very cheap, but I could not afford it; and it is a good thing that I did not buy it. But I was very greatly impressed with the utter wastage

of soil, even in rugged New Hamrpshire. I understand that many of those farms have been bought by people in the cities, and that they have been improved as summer homes. Some of the farms have been returned to cultivation.

Mr. President, we are now confronted with the problem not only of preserving the soil we have left, but of reclaiming the fertility of much of the soil on many farms which has gone to waste. I was raised on a farm in the Ohio Valley. My father was what we call a a woodsman, in a sense. I have often said rather facetiously—but there is more truth than poetry in it—that he counted the winter entirely lost that did not see him clear off 12 acres or more of new ground. It frequently fell to my lot, as soon as I could hold the plow handles, to help break up the new ground in the spring and cultivate it.

I remember, when I was about 12 years of age, that my father and I and the rest of us boys—I being the oldest—cleared off 12 acres of new ground, broke it up in the spring, burned our beds for tobacco, and cultivated it. Later we moved away from that place. Years later I drove by that little farm. The 12 acres which we had cleared in my boyhood had washed out in gullys, through soil erosion, neglect, and waste, until the house in which we lived could be buried in the gullies which had washed out over a period of 25 or 30 years. That was only a duplication of what had happened elsewhere in the country.

I have often said—and I do not think it can be denied—that even looking at it only from the standpoint of our own people, forgetting any requirement to help feed mankind outside the United States and looking at it purely from the standpoint of our own domestic welfare, as our population increases—and it is increasing and will continue to increase over the years until we shall have 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 people in the United States—each acre of land must support more people than it supported the year before. That is an inevitable, automatic result.

Our problem is now not only one of preserving what soil we have, but of reclaiming the ground from which the soil has been washed, by fertilization, by reforestation, and by whatever other methods we may adopt, in order to bring back into cultivation millions of wasted acres which were worn out and abandoned, and which must now help support the American people by the growth of crops.

I live in the Ohio Valley. Every year we see millions of acres of rich soil washed down from the hillsides into the little creeks, out into the rivers, and then into the Ohio and Mississippi and on down into the Gulf, carrying rich topsoil which can never be recovered.

Last year I passed by the little 12-acre tract which I mentioned a moment ago, which has now been reclaimed under the process of reclamation, under the intelligent treatment which has been brought about by the Soil Conservation Service. I saw that little tract of land, which in a quarter of a century had wasted away and worn out into gullies, reclaimed for cultivation. It is now a lovely pasture for cattle, hogs, and other stock. That would not have been done and could not have been done if it had not been for the inauguration of the soil-conservation program. I am satisfied that the same thing has been done on hundreds of thousands of farms and acres throughout the United States.

So, looking at it from the standpoint even of our own country alone, we cannot afford to abandon the soil conservation program. We cannot afford to continue to allow our soil to wash out into the creeks and rivers and down into the ocean. We cannot afford to hand down to generations yet to come land so impoverished so that they cannot make a living upon it. It would be nothing less than criminal for us to do so, because our people must live here. They must live upon the soil. Out of the ground must come what man eats. Therefore I deplore any effort on the part of anyone to reduce the activities of the Soil Conservation Service, to abandon it either next year, the year following, or 10 years from now, because we have not yet begun to reclaim all the soil that has been worn out and wasted during the time in which we have engaged in that wasteful process in the United States.

Mr. President, there is no more new soil. There is no more virgin soil to which our people can move after having worn out a farm. There may be some land in the West that can be brought into cultivation by irrigation and reclamation; and I am interested in that process. But, by and large, new virgin soil, as it was known in this country 50 or 100 years ago, no longer exists.

The soil conservation program has two phases. One is to preserve the soil we now have, and the other is to reclaim the fertility of the soil which has been wasted. Individual farmers cannot do that without encouragement, guidance, and assistance from the Government. The Government program has been of invaluable assistance to the agricultural regions and the agricultural processes of our country. I hope we may be so convinced of the wisdom of this process, in our own defense, in defense of our own people, and in behalf of future generations, that we shall not only not abandon the program, but shall improve it and expand it, if necessary, in order that we may have a rich country, fertile in all its regions, productive of the things the American people wish for themselves, and things which they wish to produce for the markets of the world.

For that reason, among others I could state, I shall support with enthusiasm the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to oppose the House amendment to the soil conservation program. When the time comes for a vote I shall join in the request for a yea-and-nay vote, so that the American farmer and the American people may know where each of us stands on this important conservation program which has been inaugurated by the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 42, and further insist upon its amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I shall withhold the suggestion long enough for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to request the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can obtain an order for the yeas and nays and then have a quorum call, I think we can soon reach a vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Seantors answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gurney | Morse |
| Baldwin | Hatch | Murray |
| Ball | Hawkes | Myers |
| Barkley | Hill | O'Conor |
| Brewster | Hoey | O'Daniel |
| Bricker | Holland | O'Mahoney |
| Brooks | Ives | Pepper |
| Buck | Jenner | Revercomb |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson, Va. |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kilgore | Smith |
| Capper | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Chavez | Langer | Stewart |
| Connally | Lodge | Taft |
| Cooper | Lucas | Taylor |
| Donnell | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Downey | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Dworshak | McFarland | Thye |
| Eastland | McGrath | Umstead |
| Ecton | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Ellender | McMahon | Watkins |
| Ferguson | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Flanders | Malone | White |
| Fulbright | Martin | Wiley |
| George | Maybank | Wilson |
| Green | Millikin | Young |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 42, and further insist upon its amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIBGES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are detained on official committee business. Both Senators, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained. The Senator from South Dakota, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

CARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—84

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gurney | Murray |
| Baldwin | Hatch | Myers |
| Ball | Hawkes | O'Conor |
| Barkley | Hickenlooper | O'Daniel |
| Brewster | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bricker | Hoey | Overton |
| Brooks | Holland | Pepper |
| Buck | Ives | Revercomb |
| Bushfield | Jenner, Colo. | Robertson, Va. |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kilgore | Smith |
| Capper | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Chavez | Langer | Stewart |
| Connally | Lodge | Taft |
| Cooper | Lucas | Taylor |
| Cordon | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Donnell | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Downey | McFarland | Thye |
| Dworshak | McGrath | Umstead |
| Eastland | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Ecton | McMahon | Watkins |
| Ellender | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Ferguson | Malone | White |
| Flanders | Martin | Wiley |
| Fulbright | Maybank | Wilson |
| George | Millikin | Young |
| Green | Morse | |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Moore | Tydings |
| Byrd | Reed | Wagner |
| Hayden | Robertson, Wyo. | Williams |
| McCarthy | Tobey | |

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, there is just one more amendment, amendment No. 1, dealing with penalty mail. There is a matter of $300,000 difference between the House and Senate, and it will ultimately be decided when final agreement is reached.

I now move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 1, and request a further conference with the House on all the amendments still in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate as were previously appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate insist upon its amendment No. 1, request a conference with the House on all amendments still in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint on the part of the Senate the same conferees who were previously appointed.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

REFUND OF TAXES ILLEGALLY PAID BY INDIAN CITIZENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ZALES N. ECTON,
CARL A. HATCH,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; and

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, 34, 41, 68, 85, 101, 105, 114, 124, 130, 151, and 152 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 16, 18, 39, 78, 104, 171, 176, 177, and 179 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) favoring a fair representation of American small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33);

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House concurrent resolution 51, dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House concurrent resolution 51, dealing with the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) that the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th day of May 1947.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
vision of Legislative Reports
or Department staff only)

Issued July 23, 1947
For actions of July 22, 1947
80th-1st, No. 141

CONTENTS

ricultural appropriation bill (individual items ot indexed.....1
propriations.1,4,10,16,27
sistant secretaries....17
omic energy.....8
diting.....15
nsumer credit.....6
tton.....26
ectrification, rural...5
rm program.....3
sheries.....21
Flood control.....9,27
Foreign affairs.....7
Garbage disposal.....18
Housing.....15,20
Information.....36
Labor.....32
Labor, farm.....2
Lands.....19,24
Lands, farm.....34
Lands, reclamation.....35
Latin America.....14
Minerals.....5,24
Monopolies.....30
Natural resources.....33
Nominations.....17
Personnel.....11,23,28
Prices, control.....22
R.F.C.....25
Research.....8,12
Section 32 funds.....26
Transportation.....30
Water pollution.....13,29
Water utilization.....31
Wool.....26

GHLIGHTS: House received 2nd conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. oth Houses agreed to conference report on National Science Foundation bill. Interor appropriation bill ready for President. House passed bill for disposition of arm-labor camps. House agreed to resolution for agriculture studies by Agriculture ommittee. Senate committees reported bills to extend Civil Service Retirement Act o certain farm-loan employees and to facilitate USDA flood control surveys.

## HOUSE

(pp.9881)

. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the second conference report on this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 9925-6). The conferees agreed to the following items:

Agricultural conservation program, $265,635,044 (House figure; Senate figure was $295,635,044). Administrative expenses, ACP, $24,500,000 (House, $22,000,000; Senate, $27,500,000). 1948 ACP, $150,000,000 (Senate figure; House proposed no 1948 program). Maximum payment to any participant, no limit in 1947 but $500 limit in 1948 program (Senate provision; House proposed $500 limit in 1947).

Farm-tenant loans, $15,000,000 (House, none; Senate, $20,000,000).

Meat inspection, $5,000,000 for a "meat-inspection fund" with provision for reimbursement of costs by packers (House provision; Senate proposed $11,140,000 to be financed by the Government).

Penalty mail, $3,486,000 (Senate figure; House, $3,186,000).

BAI D. C. salary limitation, $1,059,000 (House figure; Senate, $1,061,840). The statement of the House conferees says, "...the conferees herewith direct the Department of Agriculture to limit expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under 'Bureau of Animal Industry' appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (other than for meat inspection) to a sum not exceeding $651,100."

School-lunch program. The House conferees' statement says: "The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 43 which strikes out a direct appropriation of $45,000,000 provided by the

House and to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 59, authorizing $75,000,000 of section 32 funds, with an amendment providing $65,000,000, instead of $75,000,000, as provided by the Senate, together with a limitation that no part of the fund shall be used for nonfood assistance."

2. FARM LABOR. Passed without amendment H. R. 4254, providing for dispostion of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or non-profit associations of farmers (pp. 9927-8).

3. AGRICULTURE STUDIES. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 298, authorizing the Agriculture Committee "to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction, including but not limited to the study of long-range problems affecting agriculture and forestry; the study of the operation and effectiveness of" the foot-and-mouth disease campaign; "to study and make investigations into the existence and causes of shortages and surpluses of food and other agricultural commodities; to study the current and prospective demand for food and other agricultural commodities at home and abroad, and the effect thereof upon domestic agriculture" (p. 9927).

4. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 4106 (pp. 9816-7, 9889). This bill will now be sent to the President.

5. MINERALS. Passed, 175-78, with amendments H. R. 1602, to establish a National Mineral Resources Division in the Interior Department (pp. 9894-912). As passed, the bill eliminates the provision for this new Division and continues for 2 years the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc through RFC. Rep. Martin, Iowa, defended REA against copper-hoarding charges (p. 9904).

6. CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROLS. Passed with amendment H. J. Res. 222, to extend authority for modified consumer-credit controls by the Federal Reserve Board until Dec. 31, 1947 (pp. 9914-22).

7. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Agreed without amendment to H.Res. 295, authorizing the Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct studies and investigations into all matters within its jurisdiction (pp. 9926-7).

Agreed without amendment to H. Res. 296, creating a select committee to study needs of foreign countries with respect to food, clothing, economic rehabilitation, etc. (pp. 9923-5).

8. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Holifield, Calif., criticized "effort to discredit atomic-bomb scientists," and included various newspaper item excerpts on the subject (pp. 9931-5).

SENATE

9. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H.R. 3146, to authorize the Department to make flood control examinations and surveys of watersheds, concerning which the War Department is authorized to make surveys of the waterways, and authorizes the Department of Agriculture to make supplemental flood control reports when requested by either Public Works Committee (S.Rept. 682) (p. 9804).

Received from the War Department a report on Smith River, Oreg. (S.Doc.94) (p. 9808).

10. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H.R. 3123, and to the House amendments to the Senate amendments

80TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 1036

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

JULY 22, 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

## CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3601]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18, and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

*For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936,*

*as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: Provided, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,818 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": Provided further, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: Provided further, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: Provided further, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: Provided further, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: Provided further, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-*

*ment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: Provided further, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: And provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 59.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

### PENALTY MAIL

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: The House appropriated $3,186,000; the Senate, $3,486,000; the House recedes.

### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 17, relating to the limitation on expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,059,000; the Senate, $1,061,840; the Senate recedes. It should be noted that the conferees recommend the lower of the two amounts involved. In this connection, the conferees have been informed by the Department of Agriculture that if the House provision providing for the establishment of a meat-inspection fund is finally enacted, the requirements for authorization for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau during fiscal year 1948 will be reduced to $651,100. In view of the action in the accompanying report whereby the Senate recedes from its amendment by which it had stricken out the proposed meat-inspection fund (amendments Nos. 18 and 19), the conferees herewith direct the Department of Agriculture to limit expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Bureau of Animal Industry" appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (other than for meat inspection) to a sum not exceeding $651,100. In so directing, the conferees understand that the General Accounting Office will not treat expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Meat-inspection fund" as charges against the aforementioned $651,100.

### MEAT INSPECTION

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, meat inspection: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for the initial contribution to the "meat-inspection fund." The House provided that hereafter all expenses of the meat-inspection service shall be paid from the "meat-inspection fund" and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter assess and collect fees from the meat packers based upon the cost of the inspection, such fees to be paid into the "meat-inspection fund." The Senate struck out the House provision relating to the "meat-inspection fund" and

the assessing of the packers for the cost of meat inspection and provided the budget estimate of $11,140,000 for meat-inspection service. The Senate recedes.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 42:

Program: The House has proposed a 1947 program of $265,635,044; the Senate, $295,635,044; the Senate recedes.

Administrative expenses: The House has proposed $22,000,000 for administrative expenses at all levels; the Senate, $27,500,000; the conferees have agreed upon $24,500,000.

1948 program: The House proposes no program for the 1948 crop year; the Senate proposes a program of $150,000,000; the House recedes.

Maximum payment to any participant: The House proposes a limit of $500 to any participant under the 1947 program; the Senate proposes no limit for 1947, but proposes a maximum payment of $500 to any participant under the 1948 program proposed by the Senate. The House recedes.

FARM TENANT LOANS

Amendment No. 50, farm-tenant loans: The House made no provision, the Senate appropriated $20,000,000; the conferees have agreed upon $15,000,000.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Amendments Nos. 43 and 59: National School Lunch Act: The House appropriated $45,000,000 and provided—

That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches.

The Senate struck out the House provision by amendment No. 43 and inserted new language by amendment No. 59 providing for the expenditure of $75,000,000 for the program from section 32 funds, with no limitation prohibiting the use of funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 43 which strikes out a direct appropriation of $45,000,000 provided by the House and to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 59 authorizing $75,000,000 of section 32 funds, with an amendment providing $65,000,000, instead of $75,000,000, as provided by the Senate, together with a limitation that no part of the fund shall be used for nonfood assistance.

The conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate have agreed to direct attention to the fact that in the consideration of funds for the school-lunch program they have emphasized that it is essentially a local program and that the States have not done their full share in complying with the spirit of the matching provisions contained in the National School Lunch Act. The conferees of both Houses have also agreed to direct attention to the fact that it has been repeatedly asserted that many State legislatures have adjourned without taking

action to provide funds in the nature of contributions to the school-lunch program. The conferees on the part of both Houses desire to make it abundantly clear, therefore, that in connection with a reexamination of this matter for the fiscal year 1949, they are now placing the respective States on notice with respect to their obligations under this program and that failure of the State legislatures to act in the premises will have no effect in determining the future requirements of this program.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

O

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INDONESIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and the people of the world must be appalled at the display of force now being employed in Java against the colonial peoples there and which is called police action.

The United Nations Charter in chapter XI deals with the relationships between the colonial powers and their non-self-governing peoples. It certainly seems that the Netherlands should have explored fully the possibilities of using the United Nations machinery to correct the situation in which it found itself, before resorting to military action. The least that could be done now is that the Dutch Nation should explain to the people of the United States and to the people of the world exactly why the use of force was required. The understanding of the peoples of the world should be clear, that the Netherlands, itself a small nation just relieved from the distress of occupation, is not willingly bypassing its first real opportunity to proceed under the United Nations Charter with respect to a non-self-governing territory.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ARCHBISHOP ALOYSIUS STEPINAC, OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it should be necessary for me to recite to the Members of the House all of the particulars of the persecution and sham trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Yugoslavia.

The freedom-loving people of the world who respect all religions have been profoundly shocked at the harsh, unjust, and inhuman treatment that has been given to this great and humane priest. Long study by disinterested non-Catholic investigators and students of the actions of Archbishop Stepinac, as well as the persecution which was called a trial, has brought to light one of the most vicious conspiracies against Christianity that this world has ever seen. The entire record as compiled by these disinterested observers shows that the archbishop's life and motives, both during the war and in the troublesome period thereafter, were inspired and motivated by deep Christian principles, mainly, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

In those hard, trying, and desperate days he was the sole source of refuge for the people of all faiths and political beliefs in his country. He gave shelter to all who were oppressed, regardless of their religious or political beliefs. He was the solitary island of sanity and peace in a wildly confused nation. He was guilty of no sin other than his recognition of the dignity of man and the necessity of preserving mankind's body and soul.

My colleague the gentleman from New York, Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, has introduced a resolution into this House asking that the Congress and the President of the United States, through diplomatic channels, formally and vigorously protest to the Government of Yugoslavia the unjust incarceration of this saintly man and 16 of his brother priests.

Our Nation has just completed a great and cruel war. One of the alleged "four freedoms" for which we fought was freedom of religion. The nation Yugoslavia would not exist except for the free flow of American blood and American dollars during that conflict. Are we to learn now that that war was in vain and that the godless, atheistic hordes have prevailed over the forces of the Lord? Is recognized civilization to be sacrificed by Tito and his mob who consider man soulless and who feel that his body exists merely for their nefarious uses? Are these perverters of decency to be permitted to destroy the forces of good without challenge by governments which call themselves Christian?

This Congress is in its closing hours and I address myself particularly to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House and also to the members of the committee.

Gentlemen of the committee, there is ample time to act in the next few days. The people of all faiths residing in this country are looking to you for positive and immediate action in this case. It is your duty to report this bill out to the House so that we may have an affirmative vote showing the Nation's displeasure to the Yugoslavian Government. If you fail to act, I then ask all of the Members of the House, regardless of political party and regardless of faith to sign discharge petition No. 5 so that we may discharge the Foreign Affairs Committee from consideration of the Rooney resolution and take immediate action ourselves.

Gentlemen of the House, the petition lies on the Speaker's desk. It is my sincere hope that each and every one of you will see fit to affix your signature so that the world may know that this Nation honestly and sincerely believes in real liberty, the liberty that recognizes every man's right to worship his God according to his own conscience.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMERICA, HOLLAND, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it comes with poor grace for the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to be attacking the Dutch Empire with reference to one of its colonial possessions after the fiasco that he went through here yesterday in sticking the nose of Congress into the affairs of the various sovereign States of this Union.

Another thing, it is not up to the Congress of the United States, and it is not up to the United Nations to be meddling in the internal affairs of every country in the world. That is exactly what we do not want.

I know there are some people who are clamoring to make the United States subordinate to the United Nations, to make us a subsidiary, if you please. They are preaching all over the country—they want to destroy the United States and set up this super-government, this Tower of Babel, with its confusion of tongues, to control our internal affairs.

No, as long as the Dutch Empire owns Indonesia, it is none of our business what transpires there, and as long as the United States flag flies over this country it is our business as to what happens here. And as long as we maintain the several States of the Union it is the business of the several States as to what happens, so far as their internal affairs are concerned and so far as State sovereignty is concerned.

So I submit that it comes with poor grace indeed from the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] after supporting that monstrosity on yesterday to arise here and attempt to speak for the United States in attacking Holland, a friendly country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and oppoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, PLUMLEY, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, PHILLIPS of California, CANNON, SHEPPARD, and WHITTEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the United States News by David Lawrence.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INCOME-TAX LIABILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DYING IN THE SERVICE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 479) relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am heartily in favor of this bill, but I think the gentleman from Ohio should make some explanation of it. It is doing simple justice to some veterans' families.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to do two things. Both of these propositions have been unanimously approved by the unanimous vote of the Ways and Means Committee. Likewise, they have been approved by the Treasury.

In the first place, this bill seeks to correct an oversight which has been brought out as the law has been administered.

Under the present law, all the income taxes of a man in the armed services are remitted if he should die in the service and any taxes that he paid during the time he was in the service after Pearl Harbor are refunded to his estate. The present law does not provide for a rebate of any taxes that his estate or his family may have paid for him. This bill which I am asking to be passed provides that the taxes shall be refunded to anyone who might have paid them for the deceased serviceman. This is only doing the fair and equitable thing.

The second provision is that a time limit is fixed as to this plan of refunding taxes. Under the present law this practice of refunding these taxes shall continue until the President declares the war to be terminated. Instead of waiting for the President to take this action, this bill fixes the date as January 1, 1948. In other words, if any serviceman dies in the service after January 1, 1948, his estate will be compelled to pay all accrued taxes. The Treasury favors this provision of the bill because under the present law there are some servicemen who do not pay their taxes for they take the chance of having their estate relieved of making this payment in case they die in the service.

I think that under the circumstances this is a bill which should be passed immediately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 421. Abatement of Tax for Members of Armed Forces Upon Death

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, or with respect to any prior taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) during any part of which he was a member of such forces; and

"(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for taxable years preceding those specified in clause (a) which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

SEC. 2. If at any time prior to January 1, 1947, the allowance of a credit or refund of an overpayment of the tax for any taxable year specified in section 421 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (as amended by this act) is prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than sec. 3801), a credit or refund of the overpayment of such tax to the extent that the overpayment is attributable to the change in law made by this act may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if a claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1947.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and insert "January 1, 1948—"

Page 2, line 18, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "1947" and insert "1949."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 108.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of eight members, as follows: Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare an appropriate plan for the participation in the observance and celebration in Cuba during the summer of 1948 of the fiftieth anniversary of the victories of the military and naval forces of the United States and of their Cuban allies in the war with Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba. In the preparation of such plan the committee is authorized to cooperate with official representatives of Cuba.

(b) The committee shall, not later than February 2, 1948, submit a report to the Congress setting forth the plan prepared pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and containing such recommendations for carrying out such plan as it deems advisable. The committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the date of the submission of such report.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1928, as amended, to appoint and prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation, of such employees as are necessary for the execution of its function. The committee may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution, including expenditures for necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses of the members of the committee and of employees of the committee.

SEC. 4. The necessary expenses of the joint committee herein authorized not exceeding $25,000 shall be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized by the joint committee and signed by the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the appointment of a committee of four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate to report back on February 2 of next year to the Congress, recommendations in relation to the participation of our Government in the fiftieth anniversary of the Spanish-American War. The celebration in connection therewith will take place in Cuba. In other words, the Cuban Government is going to have a celebration and naturally our Government should participate. This committee, with an appropriation of $25,000, one-half to be borne by the House and one-half by the Senate, to be appointed if this resolution is agreed to, is to recommend back to us the manner and extent to which our Government shall participate in the celebration.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT OR REFUND WITH RESPECT TO WAR LOSSES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to provide for an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That if a claim for credit or refund under the internal-revenue

united nation. This resolution gives us the best available means of acting as an informed, determined, and united nation in our effort to discharge the clear responsibilities we have in the world of today and of all the days to come.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There being no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1948, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 176, and concur in the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "management" insert "now being performed in the District of Columbia."

And in line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "bureau" insert "including tract books heretofore held and administered in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose and intent of this amendment?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose and intent of section 8 as approved by the House on July 21 are to prohibit the transfer or removal of any functions or duties performed in the District of Columbia prior to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 with respect to the handling and administration of the tract books which have always been kept in the District. In accepting the amendment made to the provision by the Senate, it is understood that the original purpose and intent will continue to prevail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18, and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 59.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

PENALTY MAIL

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: The House appropriated $3,186,000; the Senate, $3,486,000; the House recedes.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 17, relating to the limitation on expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,059,000; the Senate, $1,061,840; the Senate recedes. It should be noted that the conferees recommend the lower of the two amounts involved. In this connection, the conferees have been informed by the Department of Agriculture that if the House provision providing for the establishment of a meat-inspection fund is finally enacted, the requirements for authorization for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau during fiscal year 1948 will be reduced to $651,100. In view of the action in the accompanying report whereby the Senate recedes from its amendment by which it had stricken out the proposed meat-inspection fund (amendments Nos. 18 and 19), the conferees herewith direct the Department of Agriculture to limit expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Bureau of Animal Industry" appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (other than for meat inspection) to a sum not exceeding $651,100. In so directing, the conferees understand that the General Accounting Office will not treat expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Meat-inspection fund" as charges against the aforementioned $651,100.

MEAT INSPECTION

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, meat inspection: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for the initial contribution to the "meat-inspection fund." The House provided that hereafter all expenses of the meat-inspection service shall be paid from the "meat-inspection fund" and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter assess and collect fees from the meat packers based upon the cost of the inspection, such fees to be paid into the "meat-inspection fund." The Senate struck out the House provision relating to the "meat-inspection fund" and the assessing of the packers for the cost of meat inspection and provided the budget estimate of $11,140,000 for meat-inspection service. The Senate recedes.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 42:

Program: The House has proposed a 1947 program of $265,635,044; the Senate, $295,635,044; the Senate recedes.

Administrative expenses: The House has proposed $22,000,000 for administrative expenses at all levels; the Senate, $27,500,000; the conferees have agreed upon $24,500,000.

1948 program: The House proposes no program for the 1948 crop year; the Senate proposes a program of $150,000,000; the House recedes.

Maximum payment to any participant: The House proposes a limit of $500 to any participant under the 1947 program; the Senate proposes no limit for 1947, but proposes a maximum payment of $500 to any participant under the 1948 program proposed by the Senate. The House recedes.

FARM-TENANT LOANS

Amendment No. 50, farm-tenant loans: The House made no provision, the Senate appropriated $20,000,000; the conferees have agreed upon $15,000,000.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

*National School Lunch Act*

Amendments Nos. 43 and 59: National School Lunch Act: The House appropriated $45,000,000 and provided "That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches."

The Senate struck out the House provision by amendment No. 43 and inserted new language by amendment No. 59 providing for the expenditure of $75,000,000 for the program from section 32 funds, with no limitation prohibiting the use of funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 43 which strikes out a direct appropriation of $45,000,000 provided by the House and to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 59 authorizing $75,000,000 of section 32 funds, with an amendment providing $65,000,000, instead of $75,000,000, as provided by the Senate, together with a limitation that no part of the fund shall be used for nonfood assistance.

The conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate have agreed to direct attention to the fact that in the consideration of funds for the school-lunch program they have emphasized that it is essentially a local program and that the States have not done their full share in complying with the spirit of the matching provisions contained in the National School Lunch Act. The conferees of both Houses have also agreed to direct attention to the fact that it has been repeatedly asserted that many State legislatures have adjourned without taking action to provide funds in the nature of contributions to the school-lunch program. The conferees on the part of both Houses desire to make it abundantly clear, therefore, that in connection with a reexamination of this matter for the fiscal year 1949, they are now placing the respective States on notice with respect to their obligations under this program and that failure of the State legislatures to act in the premises will have no effect in determining the future requirements of this program.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Committe on Foreign Affairs was established in 1882, and by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (1) has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and (2) is charged to exercise continuous watchfulness over the execution by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government of the laws relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally; and

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States today assumes new importance in the operations of the entire economic system of the United States and conditions the survival of free institutions both at home and abroad; and

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs has, by its reorganization in conformity with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, by setting up the appropriate staff and subcommittee organization to deal with the heavy new burden imposed upon it to make recommendations to the House of Representatives on policy issues affecting foreign affairs and on the necessary legislative action: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. That in projects for studies of matters concerning the foreign affairs of the United States which in the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs require investigations by it abroad, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff and clerical help, to accompany subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on such investigations or study missions abroad.

SEC. 3. That in making such studies and investigations abroad, it shall be the duty of such subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to keep current records and to make reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for appropriate legislative action, on the completion of any such mission, of the results of such studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittees thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 authorizes the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make the usual studies, either at home or abroad, of foreign policies and foreign programs coming directly under the jurisdiction of that committee. As I explained in my remarks on

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued July 25, 1947
For actions of July 24, 1947
80th-1st, No. 143

CONTENTS

.A.Act.....18
Agricultural appropriation bill..... 1
Appropriations.1,2,3,5,15, 16,19,29,50
Banking and currency....55
Bankruptcy.....12,27
Committees.....13
Consumer credit.....55
Corporations..... 2
Education.....24,32,48
Electrification.....31,45
Electrification, rural.14,45
Farm program.....8,22
Fire fighting.....37
Fisheries.....38
Flood control.....3,15,30
Foreign affairs...24,41,49, 56,57
Forests and forestry....23, 41,51
Grains.....43
Health.....32
Housing.....7,26
Information.....10,24,42,53
Labor, farm.....35
Lands.....6,20,54,58
Latin America.....56
Livestock and meat..... 9
Loans, farm.....4,17,44
Marketing.....18
Minerals.....6,20
Organization, executive..3,47
Patents.....59
Peanuts.....18
Personnel.....3,21,39,52
Prices.....25,43,46
R.F.C.....34
Regional authority.....30
Research.....19,37
Small business.....28
Strategic materials.....33
Territories & possessions.40
Trade, foreign.....36
Veterans' benefits..4,17,34
Water conservation.....58
Water pollution.....11
Wildlife.....54

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to 2nd conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on Government corporations appropriation bill. House passed 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. House concurred in Senate amendments to mineral-leasing bill. House agreed to resolution for housing investigation. Rep. Cooley commended accomplishments regarding farm program in last few years. Senate committees reported bills to amend Marketing Agreement Act, change peanut-quota provisions, modify Research and Marketing Act provisions regarding appropriations, revise civil service retirement law, and authorize agriculture studies. Senate passed bill transferring Crab Orchard project to Interior. Senate passed War Civil functions appropriation bill. Rep. Shafer blamed Government wheat-flour buying for increased prices. Rep. Anderson introduced bill to facilitate admission of foreign farm labor.

## HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the 2nd conference report on this bill, H. R. 3601 (pp. 10103-9). Concurred in the school-lunch amendment with an amendment reducing the amount to $65,000,000 and adding a provision that no part of the money be used for nonfood assistance (p. 10109).

2. GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3756 (pp. 10097-103). The conferees agreed to the following items: Provisions limiting the amount of assessments to be made against FCA corporations by FCA for supervisory or other services as follows: (a) Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $400,000 (Senate figure; House, $275,000; Budget estimate, $421,302); (b) Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, $181,250 (Senate figure; House, $125,000; Budget estimate, $296,286); (c) Production Credit Corporations, $232,000 (Senate figure; House, $160,000; Budget estimate, $270,017); (d) Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., $29,000 (Senate figure; House, $20,000; Budget estimate, $67,273). There were no changes in the administrative-expense limitations in the House version, for these corporations. The conferees also agreed to the House authorizations for purchase of passenger vehicles: (a) Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, 10 vehicles, and (b) Production Credit Corporations, 15 vehicles. The conferees agreed with amendments to the language proposed in Secs. 307 and 308 of the General Provisions as carried in the House bill amending Secs. 104 and 101 of the Government

Corporations Control Act, respectively. The general effect of the amended language in Sec. 307 is to make clear that the proposed changes shall apply to budgets beginning with the fiscal year 1949 and that they will apply to funds for "expenditure for operating and administrative expenses." The amendment to Sec. 308 states that the proposed change will apply to mixed-ownership Government corporations "so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States." The provision authorizing liquidation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., by the Treasury Department was not subject to change by the conferees.

3. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948. Passed with amendment this bill, H. R. 4347, which was reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1053)(pp. 10079-95). Rejected, 147-234, an amendment by Rep. Rankin, Miss., to increase the rural-delivery service (Post Office Department) item by $500,000 (pp. 10093-4).

The bill includes $2,000,000 for USDA flood control (Budget estimate, $3,000,000); $11,000,000 for the employees' loyalty program (CSC, $3,500,000; FBI, $7,500,000); and $500,000 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Regarding the employees' loyalty program, the Committee report states: "The committee is not satisfied with the plans of the Civil Service Commission inasmuch as the major activity must, of necessity, fall on the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Civil Service Commission's program contemplated a very elaborate set-up and more investigation on the part of the Commission than appears to be warranted...The Commission should restrict its activity to the barest minimum and should rely on the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigative reports."

Concerning the Organization Commission the report states: "The Commission...comprises a group admirably suited to the task. The Committee is recommending an initial appropriation of $500,000 for the Commission to begin its work. Inasmuch as the Commission has not yet had an opportunity to organize and to select staff personnel it has not been in a position to develop a detailed budget."

The report states as follows regarding the flood-control item: "The committee... provides language in the bill which makes the entire sum allowed available for actual work on the projects which are already under way. It was felt by the committee that the amounts for additional preliminary examinations and survey sshould be eliminated at this time. The $2,000,000 recommended is to supplement programs already underway in the following watersheds..."

4. FARM CREDIT. H. R. 4309, as reported (see Digest 142), authorizes FCA to make direct loans to World War II veterans at 3% interest to acquire farms, farm equipment, and personal property. Loans on farm real estate would be secured by first mortgages with a limit of $12,000 for a loan on any one farm, and loans on personalty would be secured by chattel mortgages with a limit of $4,500 for any chattel-appraisal committees appointed by FCA, and the loans made would be limited 100 percent of the appraised value of the farm unit and personal property. The bill authorizes appropriation of initial sums of $200,000,000 for real-estate loans and $100,000,000 for equipment and personal property loans, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

5. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3839 (pp. 10069-72). (See also item 16.)

6. MINERAL LEASING. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 3022, which applies

Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. It is a rather unique situation, in that because of the resignation from Congress of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], there was a shift in the chairmanship of this committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is now chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee, and the ball was passed to me after we had scored once and were ready to make another score, we hope. The harmony on this committee and the fine work and spirit exemplified and the exceptionally fine leadership of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is responsible for a better job than we might otherwise have hoped for.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it would not be fair for me to sit idly by and listen to these kind words in my behalf without saying "Thank you" to the minority members of the committee and to the majority members, all of whom have worked so diligently and so effectively to bring this most difficult bill to final agreement. No one appreciates it more than I do. The committee is now in good hands. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] will handle it in a manner befitting the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to submit a consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the conference report should be adopted. With regard to the TVA the situation is this: The House bill contained an amortization plan which I felt substantially nullified section 26 of the TVA act. It also contained a provision in section 307 which would give the Appropriations Committee authority to modify section 26 each year and thereby place TVA on a year-to-year basis. The Senate struck out both provisions. I hoped the Senate position would be sustained in conference. But the House conferees have taken out the objectionable part of the amortization plan and they have exempted TVA from section 307 and, therefore, I feel that the conference report is an acceptable agreement and settlement of the House and Senate differences. I think TVA's great contribution to the Nation has been recognized and I am glad its integrity has been fully sustained. I know that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, and the other House Members have had the best interest of TVA in mind during this entire proceeding and those of us interested in the cause of TVA are grateful to them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to close consideration of this bill without once more referring to the distinguished service rendered by Mr. Claude Hobbs, executive clerk of the subcommittee, and by Mr. George Harvey, executive clerk of the Appropriations Committee. These men have worked arduously and served exceptionally well.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: page 3, strike out all of lines 20 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That there shall be transferred to this account not to exceed $765,000 of the funds available under sections 303 and 502 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; such total funds to be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 15, strike out all of lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and all of page 16, and line 1 and line 2 down to the word "It" on page 17 and insert "Not to exceed $12,300 for the purposes of liquidation, including $3,000 for payment of terminal leave, shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis: *Provided*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, repayment of loans, property operating expenses (including project inventory), charges to surplus and operating reserve, and cost of sales of commodities, services, and property: *Provided further*, That advances of funds made in connection with the operation of housing properties are hereby authorized."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate No. 21.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 22, 1947.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing particularly new that need be offered here by way of discussion on this conference report. I may say that once more the third branch of the legislative establishment known as the conference committee has spoken. It reached an agreement on all items. While there is one item technically in disagreement, it is in agreement, and I shall move directly with respect to that item to recede and concur with an amendment.

The first amendment that we had here before under discussion was penalty mail, but of necessity we could do nothing with it at the time until certain matters of policy in this Agricultural appropriation bill were finally disposed of. So the House recedes on it. There is an increase of $300,000 on penalty mail and, I may say it will require some economies at that on the part of the Department of Agriculture in order to keep within the amount allowed.

The second item that was in disagreement when this matter was before the House was the item of meat inspection. You may recall it was the contention of the House this should be assessed against the industry in the form of a fee. There was a great deal of discussion, sometimes spirited discussion, in the committee on conference, but finally another body bowing to the superior wisdom of the House of Representatives finally receded. So beginning with the fiscal year 1948 meat inspection will be assessed against the industry. There will be an initial economy of $6,000,000 and thereafter something in excess of $11,000,000 a year.

The third item in disagreement was soil conservation payments. You may recall, of course, that the House finally concurred with an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] which modified the Senate figure somewhat but accepted the Senate language with respect to the 1947 conservation program and deleted the program for 1948. Here too we had a great deal of spirited discussion and the net upshot of the matter is that the Senate agreed as to the amounts for 1947 that are found in the so-called Case amendment. There was, however, a provision which standing alone after the deletion of the 1948 program, technically constituted a modification of the 1947 program to the extent that there would be a $500 limitation upon payments. Obviously, since the contention has been made that we are already committed to this program, it would be difficult, indeed, to sustain any contention that that $500 limitation should apply to 1947. So what we finally did was to agree with the Senate language and modify the figure downward somewhat and to agree to a 1948 crop-year program in the sum of $150,000,000. In addition thereto we compromised also on the administrative part of it. In the House we agreed upon $22,000,000. The Senate included $27,500,000 for administrative expenditures at all levels, including National, State, county, and the community committees, embracing some 110,000 people altogether. The compromise figure is $24,500,000, which should be adequate for all purposes in maintaining a field organization to carry on this so-called AAA soil-conservation payment program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would like to have the gentleman clear up one point for me. The gentleman has stated that the conference accepted the figure of $228,000,000 voted by the House under the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota. At the same time the conference report indicates the full amount as being $265,000,000, which I understand is a carry-over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was an advance made by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of acquiring lining materials that they needed, and of that initial request for $50,000,000, if I remember correctly, there is $37,000,000 still available, so that money will be added to the money carried over.

Mr. PACE. The question I wanted to ask, does it not require any legislative language in the amendment to bring that about?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe so; at least, we felt that no further legislation was necessary in order to bring that about, because that money is already available on a relationship that has been worked out in the Department.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was part of the Senate total. They put no language in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so, but it is agreed that that money is available for that purpose, and I think that is what the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has explained to my entire satisfaction, at least, with respect to the $500 payment involved in the Case amendment, which does not apply to 1947.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that all references to any limitation in connection with $500 or any other amount is now out of the bill for either 1947 or 1948.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Let me emphasize that. First, let me emphasize that the $500 limit in payment to a participant in the program does not apply to 1947. It does, however, apply to the program for 1948.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that connection, if the gentleman will permit, I understand the purpose of this limitation is to make funds go farther and to aid more farmers. If that be the purpose, if the gentleman will permit me—and I have no disposition to detain him—it is my view, for whatever it is worth, that with a program limited to $150,000,000, that instead of providing increased payments for the smaller growers, that this limitation will defeat the very purpose of the program because, as the matter now stands, one application is made for land, because the program goes to the land. This limitation will result in an increase in the administrative funds and a very materially increased one, and it will not cause the smaller growers to receive any more, because the tenants, who are by far in the majority will submit programs, and many more applications will be made, and the administrative costs will be increased, and the result will be, that if anything, the smaller growers will get a smaller amount than he is getting now, whereas, in my judgment, the larger grower will have spent a great deal more than he will get and the smaller grower will get less than he spends, and therefore the smaller grower, intended to be aided here, will not receive any more, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am of the opinion that there are at least four reasons why the program will not defeat itself and why it will work out on a select basis. The bill contains language to the effect that the money for payment purposes shall go to the States on the basis of their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary. The second item, the language carried in the bill states that the payments or grants under the program shall be continued upon the utilization of the land with respect to which said payments or grants are to be made. It is going to be a little more selective program in the future.

The third reason why I do not believe it will defeat itself is that it will carry out to a considerable extent the thought the subcommittee had in mind in the first place when they reduced the amount. They felt that those land owners in the country who get the first fruits of the soil and who have a fee ownership they also owe something to their country, to the land, and to the preservation of its natural resources. So it is only fair that when they have the ability they should carry a part of the conservation load. We express that principle in our whole tax structure today. People pay taxes to the Federal Government under the Internal Revenue code on the basis of ability to pay. There is no reason why the conservation load should not be predicated upon the same kind of theory.

I might explain in detail in connection therewith, if you have not already known it, that there are presently in the 1946 program 43,750 participants who received more than $500. I repeat that figure. There are 43,750 participating farmers who received more than $500 in payments. To be exact, those 43,750 received $48,502,000. A little very elementary arithmetic will indicate to you that the average for 43,750 farmers is $1,100.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

When we insert a $500 limitation, this is going to be the effect. The same 43,750 farmers will participate, but they cannot receive more than $500, so that the aggregate that they receive would be $21,000,000-plus. That would make a saving of nearly $27,000,000, and that money might very well be made available on a more selective basis to the people who have greater difficulty in carrying the conservation load. That is the philosophy that was in the minds of the members of the committee when we first addressed ourselves to this problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true, and I have no disposition to argue, but when you eliminate the 43,750 larger landowners you put about 500,000 tenants on there to take their place, and thereby increase the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman from Mississippi will agree that where one has the financial capacity to carry a larger share of the conservation load it is not too much to ask.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unless he is carrying it for his tenants he ought not to get it, but where he is carrying it for his tenants, and they get the benefit of it, it ought to be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fee title, though, is in the hands of somebody who can carry the load.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee that I as one Member of this House appreciate the difficulties the gentleman and his committee have had ever since the third day of January.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Nothing is ever difficult if your heart is in it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I call attention to the fact that from a soil fertility standpoint not over 3 percent of the money has been used for soil fertility up to this time. Under the old program it represented less than $50 a farm, and under the new program, if all the money allowed in overhead went for fertilizer, it would be only $25 per farm, because there are over 6,000,000 farms in the United States. So as a matter of fact, all these appropriations can do is dramatize and show the importance of fertilizer in connection with maintaining the fertility of our soil. It is not any approach to maintaining the fertility of the soil, it can only be used for demonstration purposes, to dramatize, as I said, the importance of it as a national asset. Am I right?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman is right. I am going to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has done such yeoman service on the legislative Committee on Agriculture, that in the ensuing year, perhaps over the summer and fall, he and the members of his committee can go over this whole matter and explore it, and can explore many matters in connection with the Department of Agriculture, and be ready to report a program early in January so that it will not become necessary for the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations to go first to the Rules Committee, and there in that committee battle almost alone to get a rule, and then battle once more against the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture to persuade the House that they ought to issue a rule. So I do hope that

our good friend from Wisconsin over the summer and fall will give almost prayerful attention to this important matter, and will prevail upon the members of his committee to take early action so that we might be spared at least one intervening battle in getting this bill to the floor and across the floor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The members of the agricultural committee have already anticipated the suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. We have had a bill introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in an attempt to try to meet this problem which faces us to coordinate all these soil activities. Of course, I have no way of knowing what will happen to the legislation. It is going before the full committee. I know that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will want to apply what he is able to find out in the hearings on the Cooley-Hill bill in the long-term agricultural program of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to have those assurances from my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know much work will be done between now and the time the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 comes to the floor.

The next item that was in agreement, of course, was the farm-tenant loans. In the face of the conference which the President convened here in Washington and the statement made there with respect to the increases in land prices, the members of the House subcommittee felt that this matter ought to be put off to one side until we could see more clearly whether there was going to be a little stability and leveling off in land prices just around the corner. The Senate, however, took a contrary view and inserted $20,000,000 in the bill for that purpose. We finally compromised that item and we put in $15,000,000.

The only other item that we were in disagreement on was the item on the national school-lunch program. We were not insensible to the interest manifested here on the floor of the House, and certainly it is the business of the chairman of the subcommittee to be thoroughly realistic. When the vote came on the school-lunch program, it was exactly 184 to 184 on the first round. The chairman of this committee knew then that he was on what scientists probably would call very tenuous or attenuated ground. So, he felt he ought to be in a mood to compromise somewhat. We finally did. In the first place, instead of a direct appropriation the money comes out of section 32 funds. Secondly, instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House or $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, once more we compromised liberally, and the figure that will be carried in the amendment that will be offered directly is $65,000,000. We are admonishing the State legislatures that next year when the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 comes before us we shall not want to hear and we shall give no credit to the force of any argument that is made that the legislatures forgot to take action before they adjourned and went home and forgot about the school lunch. We propose to send them a copy of this report and we propose to send a copy to the educational authorities in every State so that it will come to the attention of the chief executive of every Commonwealth in the country and to the State educational authorities and the members of the legislatures. After all, they have some responsibility in a national school-lunch program because this is, after all, a local proposition.

I ask you, in all earnestness and sincerity, why should a school-lunch program be carried in an agricultural appropriation bill? You say, "Oh, it relates to food." Does it? The abundant foods do not even have to be purchased by the schools today. I saw the statement of a school in one of the Western States. They got a reimbursement of $1,500 and there was about $40 of abundant food for the whole month. They bought only because they were so disposed and not because the law required them to. This is a cash program. When this money is made available it will be hacked up into quarters and each allocation will be made to the respective States.

Then, of course, it goes to them in cash. This is a cash subsidy for the States today. I was going to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], that this program properly belongs in his bill for the Office of Education, because it is cash and it deals with schools. I cannot see the wisdom of having 431 people in the Department of Agriculture, as an entirely separate entity, giving themselves over to the administration and auditing of the school-lunch program, when the Office of Education, in the Federal Security Agency, is already tooled up in order to deal with the schools of the country. So I suggest once more to the gentleman from Wisconsin that when you devote yourself to these labors during the summer and fall, think seriously about amending the school-lunch program of 1946 with a view of giving attention to the possibility of transferring this program where it properly belongs, in the Office of Education and not in the Agricultural Department Appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Under the Reorganization bill, the Committee on Agriculture no longer has jurisdiction over the school lunches. That has been transferred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as the gentleman, I am sure, knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Fine. I hope my good friend from Kansas will speak to the chairman of the Committee on Education and probably aid in having this matter transferred to the agency in Government where it properly belongs.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. With respect to the gentleman's statement that this is going to be called to the attention of the State legislatures next year, the majority of the State legislatures, including my own will not meet next year. So I submit it may require greater deferment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We will bring it to the attention of those legislatures that are in session. I go on the theory that the State legislatures must take judicial notice of the things that are being done in Washington; and if they do not do it, that is their hard luck, not ours. They have a very abiding responsibility in the matter.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I certainly do want to congratulate the gentleman on his proposal to call to the attention of the different State superintendents of schools the action taken by the committee. But it is not entirely clear to me what it is the conferees want the States to do. It is provided in the School Lunch Act that the matching shall be on a graduated basis through the years and there should be greater State participation through the years. Exactly what is it the conferees have in mind?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here is what we propose to do, if it can be brought about. In the first place, the States put up only $11,500,000 for the last program. They took credit for $25,000,000 of contribution made by Rotary Clubs, American Legion Posts, Kiwanis Clubs, churches, labor that was supplied. The States have taken credit for it, the theory being that this money was derived from sources within the State. So when they work out the matching provision, which, incidentally, is worked out under order by the Secretary of Agriculture, it looks to me as though the States are shirking in their responsibility in this matter. In proportion as they go up, it might be that finally the Federal Government can come down a little, before it is entirely engulfed by the school-lunch program.

There is a move afoot now in two directions. The first is to increase the number of participating schools. There are 50,000 schools in the program now. There are 225,000 schools that are eligible for the program.

The second force that is operating right now is to have the Federal Government carry the whole load. I stated to the distinguished Senator from Georgia the other day that notwithstanding the fact that the act is on the books, an endeavor will be made somewhere along the line, not too far from now, to modify the act, so that finally good old Uncle Sam, with a debt of $258,000,000,000, should carry the whole load. Then, if you extend the number of schools, you can foresee the figure that people have been discussing in weeks and months, namely, a program that may eventually cost the United States $350,000,000 or $400,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Am I correct in my understanding that as for the compromise the funds derived from the sale of lunches are still permitted for matching purposes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. Within the wisdom of the conference committee it was necessary for the House to recede on the interdiction it had written in the bill when the bill was before us first. So the funds that will be contributed by the youngsters for their lunches under this bill will be considered for matching purposes. My friend from New York shakes his head. I will shake my head in the same fashion as being in agreement with the sentiment he expresses.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For the benefit of the RECORD will the gentleman kindly explain the paragraph under the School Lunch Act in regard to the $10,000,000 for equipment and whether or not we now have $65,000,000 or $75,000,000 under the program?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

We have $65,000,000 and no part thereof shall be used for nonfood assistance. Let me explain that. Under the National School Lunch Act there is a provision that $10,000,000 shall—that is the language of the act—shall be used for nonfood assistance. That means equipment and so forth. Because we have diminished the amount it was the concensus of the conference committee that all of it should be used for food and none for the purchase of equipment on the theory that equipment purchases could be deferred a little longer. Consequently, when the motion is offered to concur it will be with an amendment containing a proviso limiting the use of the money to feeding purposes as distinguished from equipment purposes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I, as one, appreciate the efforts the gentleman has put forth in trying to place the responsibility for the hot school lunch program where it belongs, the States. Regrettable as is the situation in which we find ourselves in having to continue this program, nevertheless we must keep up the fight to put this responsibility back where it belongs, on the States and local communities. Let them carry the program there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that virtue is on our side, and with virtue on our side we shall overcome all the forces of evil that can ever be pitted against this program.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I hope the gentleman is serious about notifying the schools throughout the country and the State legislatures that the States are not contributing their fair share to this program. Did not the gentleman himself suggest that the Federal Government would withdraw from this program in the course of a few years? I hope the gentleman will continue with his efforts, because I think we ought gradually to withdraw from the program and let the States assume the burden.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That, of course, is a matter for the Congress to determine. It was the original intent of the act when the program started that eventually the Federal Government would withdraw.

Mr. PACE. That is the purpose of the School Lunch Act today, that the Federal contribution is to be decreased and the States take it up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The difficulty, of course, is the number of schools in it. If the force becomes strong enough they will work for a larger and larger Government share.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, is "Doctor" DIRKSEN now going to try to repair the backbone of the Nation?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. This program is unfair to at least one of the States which has been matching, that is the State of Utah. I think if you read the report you will find that my State not only has matched out of State funds their full share but they have also paid over a hundred thousand dollars additional money for matching purposes, and not one penny of it has come out of the school children.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Utah that I think we ought to send a citation to the State of Utah.

Now, before I conclude, I think you will be interested in a few tokens. Very many people ask, and particularly Members: "How much money did you actually save?" It is a very pertinent and enticing subject. First, let me give you the budget figures, then I will give you our own figures so they will be easy to remember.

The budget that came before us for 1948 was roughly $1,200,000,000. As the bill left the House it carried appropriations and authorizations of all kinds totalling roughly $850,000,000. The budget figure $1,200,000,000; the figure approved by the House, $850,000,000.

The figure written into the bill by the Senate in round figures, within $2,000,000, was $1,050,000,000. The House figure was $850,000,000; the Senate figure was $1,050,000,000.

The bill as it will be finally passed is $960,000,000.

So that we finally contrived an overall economy in this bill of about $228,000,000. It is not as big as I would wish in view of the demands upon our economy and the need for maintaining a sound fiscal integrity in the country, but at least, it is a start. May I say to you that we have set the stage for something better on the Agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. You see, when you talk about economy you must figure 1948 and 1949 because after all it is part of the same Congress and necessarily it takes time to prepare the stage. I can best exemplify that in this fashion: The full saving on meat inspection becomes effective next year. That will be $11,000,000. There will be a $150,000,000 saving on soil conservation service payments. That will be $151,000,00 below the budget figure for 1947, it will be $51,000,000 below the President's proposed budget figure, as indicated in his message for the fiscal year 1949. So we start out with a very substantial economy in the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I shall insert a table showing the final action on the bill.

*Summary of appropriations and loan authorizations in Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1948, compared with 1947, House bill, 1948, and Senate bill, 1948*

| Item | Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947 | Budget estimates, 1948 | House bill, 1948 | Senate bill, 1948 | Bill as finally passed | Bill as finally passed— Compared with House bill (+) or (−) | Bill as finally passed— Compared with Senate bill (+) or (−) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct appropriations in agricultural appropriation bill | $643,154,411 | $805,141,608 | $571,697,388 | $664,773,798 | [1] $615,615,198 | [1] +$43,917,810 | −$49,158,600 |
| Permanent appropriations | 127,747,348 | 158,429,710 | 50,429,710 | 133,429,710 | 119,429,710 | +69,000,000 | −14,000,000 |
| Total, direct appropriations | 770,901,759 | 963,571,318 | 622,127,098 | 798,203,508 | 735,044,908 | +112,917,810 | −63,158,600 |
| Reappropriations | 133,784,292 | | | | | | |
| Borrowings authorized (From RFC and Secretary of the Treasury) | 370,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 225,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 225,000,000 | | −25,000,000 |
| Total, appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations to borrow from RFC and Secretary of the Treasury | 1,274,686,051 | 1,188,571,318 | 847,127,098 | 1,048,203,508 | 960,044,908 | +112,917,810 | −88,158,600 |

[1] Assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system for examination and supervisory services are appropriated in Agricultural Appropriation Act subject to provision therefor in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, on which final Congressional action is pending. Therefore, amounts for such assessments are shown in these columns on basis of the Government Corporations Appropriations bill as passed by the Senate.

I think that what we have done that is highly important is that we have established a reasonable, conservative base. Had this figure gone too high it would be the base for future operations of the Department of Agriculture; so it would be even more difficult a year hence to effectuate economies than it was for the fiscal year 1948. So I am very happy at the showing that was made, and I trust in the fiscal year 1949 this very good and patient labor can be carried on.

Before I conclude and offer the motion to recede and concur with an amendment on school lunches, which is only technically in disagreement, may I express to the members of the subcommittee my deep and genuine appreciation for their diligence and for their devotion. There was hardly a session in all the 7 weeks but what every member of the subcommittee was present. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] had a committee going, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] had a committee going, as did also the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had a deficiency committee going, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] had the Government corporations appropriation bill. Every member of the committee was busy with their work, yet they gave so freely of their time, and I am deeply grateful not only for their diligence but for the tolerant viewpoint that they brought to the problems that we sought to wrestle with and hew out into what we thought were sound conclusions.

Finally, as you well know, it would be difficult for a subcommittee to labor on as it does and get to the point of conclusion unless it had most efficient assistance. I not only esteem Arthur Orr the executive secretary of the committee, but I esteem him as a personal friend. I say to him, Thanks a million. And to Paul Wilson, I thank him too for his splendid work that has made our labor in the committee pleasant.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as bad as this bill is, it is infinitely better than it was when it went to the Senate.

In order to appreciate what is being done here to destroy the plan of agricultural rehabilitation which has meant so much to the farmers of the country, let me merely cite the figures with which we implemented this same bill before the war and after the war.

Just the year before the war began we appropriated in this bill $1,649,500,000. This year, in the pending bill we provided in the bill, for the same purposes, as it went to the Senate, $847,127,098, one half of the amount we provided for this purpose before the war.

Now, to appreciate what that means let me call your attention to an editorial appearing this week in an important national journal, on the value of money appropriated before the war and after the war.

Here it is:

There is a marked difference in the purchasing power of a prewar dollar and the dollars you have today. The 1947 dollar has lost about half of its prewar purchasing power.

In other words, my friends, we have provided in this bill, as sent to the Senate only one-half of the number of dollars we provided for the same purpose before the war started. And today even that number of dollars is only equal, in purchasing power, to half that number of dollars before the war.

So what we really sent to the Senate in this bill was only one-fourth of the amount we appropriated for the farmer before the war.

Now, this was not done under a bushel. It was done deliberately after intensive planning begun long before Congress convened for the session. And on that account I especially regretted to hear my friend say that it was easy to do the job because his heart was in it. His heart was in this plan to wreck the farm program which has meant so much to the country. It was a labor of love. Where we serviced the farmer's program with a dollar in 1940, we toss him a two-bit piece in 1947.

And we even begrudge him that much. For we are told just now that the figures originally planned for this bill has to be rationalized in order to conform to the militant spirit of the House as indicated in the vote overturning the committee's plan to eliminate the school-lunch program, and the attitude of the House on soldiers' loans, soil conservation and the rehabilitation of our natural resources.

Now, let us look at the bill briefly, because I have been given only 10 minutes of the hour.

I deprecate the proposition to throw the cost of meat inspection on the farmer. Beginning back something like half a century ago, when there was such an imposition on the public in the standardization of meat and the price and the health of the consumer, in order to insure the quality and value of meat, we enacted the meat inspection law. From its very nature it was a Federal service. And no governmental activity has been more successful or more satisfactory either to the producer or the consumer. Now, it is proposed in this bill to invalidate the system which has been in effect for 50 years and substitute a plan which will preclude uniformity of administration and throw the cost of such inspection as there is on the consumer.

Here is what will happen. Numbers of small packing plants will spring up in every State, and they will engage solely in intrastate commerce. They will not be responsible to the Federal Government because they will not cross State lines. And instead of meat being inspected in interstate commerce and under the responsibility of the Federal Government, they will have no inspection except such as the States may give, and perhaps not at all. It will shift the whole proposition from Federal commerce to State supervision, and what expense there is must be borne by the producer.

The packers never pay such charges. You will recall that during the First World War, when a processing tax was levied, many processors said to the consumer, "There is a processing tax of $2.50 a hundred on hogs. We cannot afford to pay it, so you will have to pay that much more for your meat." When the farmer brought in his hogs, they said, "There is a tax of $2.50 on hogs, and as we cannot absorb it, we will pay you that much less for your hogs." About that time the Supreme Court held the tax unconstitutional and ordered the tax refunded. So the processors said to the Government, "We paid the tax, and the refund comes to us." In that way they collected the tax three times; from the consumer, the producer, and the Government. And that is what will happen here. It may be a small amount. It may be only a fraction of a cent. But the farmer will pay whatever it is and enough extra to make up the breakage.

This bill not only denies funds necessary to support the farm program but it saddles on the back of the farmer expenses he has never borne before.

We are told in the debate just now that when anything is to be done for the farmer, it is Uncle Sam who always pays the bills. But when a similar service is rendered anyone else, nothing is said about Uncle Sam paying the bills, although it comes out of the same pocket. Great business interests have been taken care of this session—for example when a law was passed excusing the railroads from carrying war supplies at the rates contracted when the roads were built with proceeds of public lands—it was money out of the Treasury. But nothing was said about Uncle Sam paying the bill. And here this week we passed a bill to pay the zinc and copper mine owners a bonus—and nothing was said about Uncle Sam paying the bill. Time without number similar laws have been enacted but it is only when some comparatively small thing is being done for the farmer that we are reminded that Uncle Sam pays the bills. And every dollar invested in the farmer is an investment in national prosperity. But for this investment in 1940 and other years the farmer could not have produced in such record-breaking abundance during the war. And without the bumper crops which the farmer contributed to the war effort we could not have maintained production in the war factories or maintained our armies, and the armies of our allies on the war front. Uncle Sam has been repaid and will continue to be repaid every dollar invested in the farm program with interest.

Support of the farm program is being denied in the name of economy. But the farmer is the only one on whom economy is practiced. Note the bill passed here on the floor just a few minutes ago. It provides seven great dams for a territory covered practically by one congressional district. Four of these dams are unbudgeted and the other three largely overlap. One good dam—and one of these dams will hold the flow of the river for 2 years—one of these dams will service the over-all flood control of the river, as a whole, as well as the entire seven dams. And the total cost of the dams is approximately $500,000,000. We are denying in this bill, as it passed the House, a mere thirty million for the children of America. We are refusing a hundred million for the veterans. We are denying national agriculture a couple of hundred million for conservation. But we give approximately one congressional district $500,-

000,000 for projects the major part of which are not essential to the flood control of the river.

This bill is the greatest monkey wrench ever thrown into the national machinery. As originally drafted, it wiped out completely the 1948 program for soil conservation. Not a penny was provided for loan service to veterans who wanted to establish homes on the land. The money appropriated for REA was cut down, and the school lunch, an investment in the lives and bodies of children, was eliminated.

But, fortunately, the Senate intervened and we have been able to salvage something from the wreckage. It is still far from being the bill we should have had—the bill the farmers had every right to expect. But we must accept the inevitable. We must take half a loaf if we cannot get a whole loaf. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we support the conference report on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I append a tabular summary of the over-all totals of the bill:

*Agriculture Department appropriation bill*

OVER-ALL GRAND TOTALS

| | |
|---|---|
| 1940 appropriations | $1,649,500,000 |
| 1947 appropriations | 1,274,686,051 |
| Budget for 1948 | 1,188,571,318 |
| House bill | 847,127,098 |
| Senate bill | 1,048,203,508 |
| As finally agreed to | 960,044,908 |
| More than the House by | 112,917,810 |
| Less than the Senate by | 88,158,600 |

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, where agreement has been reached you may wonder why time is taken to discuss these measures. But today ends a fight that began back in February on the agrigultural appropriation bill for this fiscal year, a fight to which I have given untold hours of time and spoken on this floor not less than a dozen times. Everyone believes in economy, but anouncement was made that the majority party, the Republican Party, had been elected on that program. In February, I believe it was, we were advised what cuts might be expected in the Department of Agriculture. Many cuts could have been made, should have been made, and have been made. Yet this announcement carried, in my judgment, many eliminations of programs highly vital to the welfare of the United States and particularly to the farmers of this Nation.

At that time I started making every effort to try to save these programs which meant so much, in my judgment, to the American people. From that time until this day that fight has been continued.

I do not question the sincerity of my Republican colleagues on this committee, for whom I have the highest personal regard, but on their judgment with regard to what was adequate and proper for American agriculture we differed most widely. On that question we differed very much on what would be for the benefit of the American farmer, the American people, and this Republic. That fight has continued and the records of this House will show each advance from the drastic announcement in February to the figures included in this conference report has been in many instances bitterly contested and in all instances strongly contested. It has been a continual problem to advance step by step.

I think it was not our fight, but it was the fight of the American people. The people were advised as to just what was intended by these reductions. We spent in this Nation through the action of the Congress approximately $6,000,000,000 in permitting business to reconvert after the war, and yet during the war we called on the American farmers to extend themselves and work harder and misuse their soil and they did just as fine a job as any industry in the United States and yet we on the Democratic side have had a 5-month fight to provide $265,000,000 committed last year as one-third of the cost of redeeming soil depletion, a natural resource vital to the welfare of the Nation.

Here we find, in my judgment at least, that a majority of the Members of the House were unwilling to carry out the commitments which I considered commitments, though they may differ with me, on the soil-conservation program. We have finally brought here a bill which I do not think is too far out of line. It comes to us after the most untiring efforts on the part of the friends of agriculture against the members of this committee who themselves feel that they are also friends of agriculture but whose actions and whose judgments certainly differ from mine as to what is in the best interests of the Nation and of agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman just mentioned the differences of opinion as to the commitments for this year. Will the gentleman make it plain that there cannot be any difference of opinion as to the commitment next year for at least $150,000,000 for the farmers for the soil-conservation program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I find quite frequently that I do not speak for anybody, but so far as my opinion is concerned there was much discussion as to whether to put a figure in next year's program. I insisted that a program without a figure was no program at all. You cannot have a program without a figure. And if you put a figure in and fix the program and the department announces it and the farmers earn what they are entitled to under it, spending more of their funds than does the Government, I do not think there can be any question but what there is an obligation and an outright commitment. I can speak only for myself and the Members on my own side. But this bill, if you will check it, is not too far out of line with what should have been done for agriculture, in my judgment. This gives $265,000,000 for the AAA payments, and I doubt that more than that will be earned for the reason that the program has been stymied for 60 days as the result of what the House did before. The President recommended $200,000,000 next year and only $150,000,000 is carried in this bill, though to get this program it became necessary to accept the limitation. But each of those places where this bill is improved over the original House action has come back as a result of the untiring efforts on the part of the Democrats on this committee, friends of agriculture on this side of the Capitol and on the other side. In making this advance against the opposition of the Republican Members we have veritably had to fight at every fence post.

In February they announced there would be no funds for AAA payments, no farm tenant purchase program for veterans, drastic reductions in the REA and no school-lunch program, no marketing research funds and no section 32 funds—funds set aside for agriculture as a result of allowing competitive agricultural products to come into this country from abroad. I released those facts to the Nation. The majority Members could not hold to that and our original bill was better than the original announcement the majority Members made.

After a 2-day fight here on the floor we saved $40,000,000 of section 32 funds, and obtained sufficient funds for agricultural research in marketing.

The Senate then improved the bill and when we came back to the House on the AAA payments we, after a hard fight, won on a vote to recede and figures were written into the bill more nearly carrying out the pledge made by this Congress last year. The chairman defeated us on several other votes but only after agreeing to try to work the issues out in the second conference.

Today this report provides $265,000,000 for AAA together with a program that next year provides for continuation of the school lunch, adequate funds for research, and almost enough for the REA. It provides for the farm tenant purchase program and continues for the use of agriculture section 32 funds which by statute belong to agriculture. All of these the Republican majority said they would not provide for when we met in February. It has been a long, hard road, but I feel we have won out. Certainly the great progress made during the past few years to more nearly put the farmer on a comparable basis with labor, guaranteed minimum wages and hours and industry protected by tariffs should not be destroyed. We have saved the farmer for one more year at least.

This we have done in spite of the active opposition of our Republican colleagues or at least most of them. They have approved this report. I would like to believe they have been converted—this the record refutes because most of them have fought to the last ditch to destroy these programs which in my judgment are so vital to the American farmer and the American people. Truly I am glad their original views have not prevailed. It is no wonder that, though I have the highest regard for my Republican colleagues both on the committee and off, I believe it is to the best interest of the American farmer that we have a Democratic rather than a Republican majority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I happen to come from Wisconsin, a State where the farmers farm their farms and do not lie awake nights figuring out schemes to get money out of the United States Treasury. When he sheds tears, I do not want him to shed any for me, because I will take my chances in telling the people the truth about agricultural appropriations. I might tell them what his administration has done for the fur farmers of this country; how it has wrecked them. I could also call his attention to the fact that, as one Member of Congress, I surely have not been a party to wrecking the sheep industry of this country.

Right in this bill you will find where we are going to get the money for your school lunches. You will get it out of section 32 funds. Where do you get section 32 funds? You get it by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts. From 25 to 35 percent of the customs receipts come from wool, the wool that is grown on sheep and imported to this country. You take the 30 percent of customs receipts, I would like to know, when Mr. Clayton gets through conniving with these foreign cartels and monopolies that do not dare to set up in the United States because they would come under the Sherman Antitrust Act—I would like to know where you are going to get any section 32 funds to carry on your school lunches, because there will not be any money there if Mr. Clayton has his way about it.

Now, we have enough problems in this country so far as agriculture is concerned. In 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, we had 54-cent wheat, we had 5-cent hogs, we had 8-cent cotton. Basically, we are in just as bad shape as we were in 1932. If this soil fertility was of so much interest to these people, why did they use only 3 percent of the money for fertilizer and use 90 percent in a feeble attempt to try to purchase something else?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since the present bill was originally introduced in the House several weeks ago, the welfare of the farmer has been seriously threatened by the action of this Congress. The present version of the bill is better than anything previously offered the House this session but it is still very unsatisfactory in many particulars—the pledge to the producers in AAA funds is still not fully met, and the provisions of the 1948 crop year are unsatisfactory.

The farmers of the Nation have the Democrats of the House and Senate to thank for the fact that this bill goes as far as it does in the interest of American agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the conference report I ask unanimous consent to insert some tables containing information the Members might like.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a request at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 61, strike out lines 5 to 10 inclusive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 81, line 12, insert:

"To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25-percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "$75,000,000" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$65,000,000"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes action on the conference report.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is obliged to say that owing to the objection of the minority leader it will be impossible to entertain the request at this time.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is obliged to say that the Chair cannot entertain requests for extensions at this time.

## RESIGNATION FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., July 24, 1947.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: I hereby tender my resignation from the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sincerely,

TOM PICKETT,
*Member of Congress,*
*Seventh District of Texas.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 328).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 329).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 104.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representative who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind or nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes and zoning laws contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Federal, State, and municipal government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighteth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and thet production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and at this time I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is brought in here for the purpose of trying to deal with the housing situation. It provides for a complete and full investigation. The Banking and Currency Committee has given consideration to such legislation and the members of that committee feel that this investigation is essential to the welfare of the country and also because of the fact that there has been so much said in the last few months regarding the housing situation. I know from the sentiment that was expressed in the committee that it wants to do everything possible to aid and assist the veterans. In order that the veterans and the people of this country who need materials to support the housing program may be helped, this committee certainly should be able to do a job that would be in the interest of the country in every respect. I feel sure that we will be doing a good job to pass this resolution.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who just preceded me, has stated that there is serious need for housing in the United States. In that statement I am in hearty accord. Many of the things which the gentleman said are true, and conditions should be investigated.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, which has jurisdiction over housing, has been a very busy committee since it began hearings about the 1st of February. We have been in daily session, quite often while the House was in session. There has been much emergency legislation which has had to be taken care of.

As a matter of fact, we have not done very much in the Committee on Banking and Currency on legislation that was not urgently required. Much of it is in the field of housing, but it has been more or less a peacemeal program because of the necessity for expeditious action on legislation which has been brought before us. We had to correct certain abuses and do it very quickly. We took cognizance of the fact, for example, that under these strict Government controls, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] referred, during the year 1946, when no piece of material which went into the building of a home could be obtained without permission of the Housing Expediter, we completed about 650,000 homes. The last year of free enterprise building was 1941. In that year, without any Government controls, and without the tremendous demand for homes that there was in 1946, we completed 714,000 homes. The Government program, to which the gentleman referred, was recognized as a failure, and we had to act expeditiously to start home construction. I think we can all take heart from the fact that on last Sunday, in a press release by Mr. Frank Creedon, the Expediter, he made a statement that there had been more houses started in June of this year than had been started in any month in 20 years and that in the first 6 months of this year there had been more homes started and finished than in any comparable period in 20 years. I think that proves the value of the services which we gave here in this House in respect to removing the shackles which were deterring the building of homes.

There are many fields in which the House Banking and Currency Committee acts, but none is more important than housing. We all realize that one of the bottlenecks preventing the stabilization of our American economy lies in the lack of housing at the present time. Our population has increased over 10,000,000 since the 1940 census. The number of families has increased about 7,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan three additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was, of course, very little, if any, housing constructed during the war except emergency war housing. We now want to find out what can be done to expedite home construction. We want to find out if the bottleneck is in the building-materials field. We want to find out if it is necessary to expand the credit base to make credit available for the construction of homes. We want to find out very definitely the extent to which the Federal Government, the States, the counties, the municipalities should participate in public housing for low rentals.

We recognize, I believe, that there is a field in which the Federal Government should operate in encouraging the construction of public housing. We want to find out how expansive or how narrow that field should be. This study we hope will result in the answer to that and many other problems.

Under the provisions of this resolution, we are without limit to study all phases of the housing problem. After enumerating many of them which prescribe consideration in particular fields we end up by saying that the committee may study such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate. That is all-inclusive, and when we make the report on March 15, 1948, as is required by the resolution, I feel confident that the people of the Nation will feel that the money which will

Committee (p. 10368).

35. PURCHASING. S. 1728, by Sen. Aiken, Vt., for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply; to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 10368).

36. POULTRY. S. J. Res. 154, by Sen. Baldwin, Conn., to authorize issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the 100th anniversary of the poultry business in the U. S.; to Civil Service Committee (p. 10368).

37. EXPORT CONTROLS. S. Res. 158, by Sen. Thomas, Okla., to direct the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to investigate administration of export controls on agricultural commodities by the Commerce Department; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 10369, where resolution is printed in full).

38. SMALL BUSINESS. S. 1740, by Sen. Murray, Mont., providing for a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation; to Banking and Currency Committee. Remarks of author. (p. 10435.)

39. LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE. H. R. 4389, by Rep. Corbett, Pa., to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act so as to relieve the Legislative Reference Service of preparation of data in certain cases. To House Administration Committee. (p. 10357.)

40. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. H. R. 4397, by Rep. Lemke, N. Dak., to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 10357).

41. PRICE CONTROL. H. J. Res. 253, to reestablish effective price and rent control; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 10357).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 25

42. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Aiken, Vt., inserted a radio interview with Sen. Wiley on this proposed project (pp. A4061-2).

43. COOPERATIVES. Rep. Patman, Tex., inserted his address defending cooperatives against current criticisms (pp. A4063-6).

44. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Stewart, Tenn., inserted a Farm Bureau summary of H. R. 4150, H. R. 4151, and S. 1621, to divide SCS functions between ARA and Extension Service (pp. A4067-8).

45. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bennett, Mo., defending congressional reductions in USDA appropriations (pp. A4083-5).

46. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Kefauver, Tenn., favoring additional changes in congressional organization, etc. (pp. A4086-7).

47. FLOOD CONTROL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Banta, Mo., criticizing administration of the flood-control program and urging more coordination of the various participating agencies (pp. A4087-8).

48. POULTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Boggs, Del., commending development of the poultry industry in the U. S. (p. A4092).

SENATE - July 26

49. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the second conference report on H. R. 3601, the agricultural appropriation bill, and concurred in the House amendment to the Senate amendment regarding the school-lunch program (pp. 10486-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Both Houses agreed to a revised conference report on H. R. 3756, the Government corporations appropriation bill, which, in addition to provisions of the first version of the conference report, eliminates Sec. 307 of the bill, regarding additional corporation controls (pp. 10522-6, 10528, 10577-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4269, the first supplemental appropriation bill, 1948 (pp. 10539-49, 10604-5). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conferees agreed to $75,000 for the Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, $17,500 for the BAI animal-husbandry item, $600,000,000 for government and relief in the occupied areas, a provision expressing congressional opinion that expenditures for food stuffs should be for those items which can be purchased with benefit to the national economy, and $210,000 for Sugar Rationing Administration.

Passed with amendments H. R. 4347, the second supplemental appropriation bill, and both Houses agreed to the conference report (pp. 10460-1, 10480-6, 10571, 10587-93, 10630-1). This bill will now be sent to the President. The Senate inserted $500,000 to continue the Remount Service in the War Department temporarily, and the conferees agreed to $350,000 for this purpose (p.10483). The Senate inserted $15,000 for E&PQ insect investigations, and the conferees agreed to $5,000 for this item (p. 10482). The Senate increased the item for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch from $500,000 to $1,000,000, and the conferees agreed to $750,000 (p. 10481).

Sens. Lucas, Ill., and Myers, Pa., discussed appropriation reductions and the history of the Legislative Budget, criticizing the manner of effectuating this provision (pp. 10504-10, 10518-19).

The "Daily Digest" includes a statement showing the amounts in the various appropriation bills in their different legislative stages (p. D616).

50. CROP INSURANCE. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 1326, to limit the crop-insurance program to essentially an experimental basis (pp. 10478-9, 10580-1). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conference bill authorizes wheat insurance in 56 counties, corn and flax insurance in 50 counties each, and tobacco insurance in 35 counties; includes the Senate provision regarding reconstitution of the board of directors of FCIC, the Senate provision regarding suits against FCIC and by it, and the Senate limitation on reinsurance.

51. MARKETING AGREEMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 452, to make various amendments to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act (pp. 10463-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

52. FORESTS. The "Daily Digest" states that H. J. Res. 205, to authorize sale of timber in the Tongass National Forest in such a way as to facilitate pulp production in Alaska, was passed (p. D612); however, the Congressional Record itself does not show this action, since it went to press before the Senate adjourned.

Passed without amendment H. R. 3395, to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif. (p. 10467). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if the Bonny Dam, listed on page 11, an item of $800,000, comes under the budget estimate?

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Culbertson Dam, $300,000?

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Enders Dam, $700,000?

Mr. BALL. That is $300,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask about the Platte Basin, Narrows Dam, $300,000.

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that in the Interior Department Subcommittee we held hearings on these questions. This is the particular area in which there has been so much flood damage. Not only has there been loss of life, but there have been great losses of property. The estimate of the engineers, who testified after the Interior Department appropriations had been considered, was to the effect that the damage exceeded by far the amount which was first estimated. Also an independent agency in Kansas City, Mo., made estimates. The testimony of the Army engineers was that flood damage in the Republican River and the Missouri River Valley Basin would total more than $110,000,000 for this year alone.

I should like to say just as forcefully and sincerely and honestly as I can that the Department of the Interior considered these appropriations. They have all been authorized. The Enders Dam has been under construction, and the only reason why it comes up in a supplemental bill is that we were not permitted to have the amount which was necessary in the first instance. These projects all come within the budget. I think all of them are still in the budget which has been allowed. So far as these projects are concerned, they are meritorious. They come within the budget, and I hope that at least these projects may not be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Georgia relates only to projects without the benefit of budget estimates.

Mr. WHERRY. Earlier in the day I had a discussion with certain Senators who, I understood, were objecting to any supplemental appropriations. I wished to make the record clear that so far as these four appropriations with reference to the State of Nebraska are concerned, they have already been recognized. They are authorized; and the only reason there is a supplemental budget is that the engineers and those in authority felt that additional amounts were necessary at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Minnesota if the Bixby Dam, for which the House allocated $500,000, is within the budget.

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate at all for that project.

Mr. GURNEY. How about the next one, the Keyhole Dam, in Wyoming?

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate for that.

Mr. GURNEY. How about the Shadehill Dam?

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate for that. There is none for the Cannonball.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Let the Chair observe that if the Senate is to act on these amendments, they will have to be sent to the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the amendments can be offered in the form of a motion.

I move to strike out line 2 on page 11, line 3 on page 11, line 6 on page 11, and line 7 on page 11, in order that the conferees may have an opportunity to examine these projects, which are brought forward on the last day in the session, and which do not have the benefit of any budget estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the Senate understands the motion.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the motion be stated for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 2, 3, 6, and 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any desire to have the items considered separately? Without objection, the items will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia to strike out, on page 11, lines 2, 3, 6, and 7.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 11, line 4.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, at the beginning of line 4, it is proposed to strike out "Heart Butte Dam", and insert in lieu thereof "Heart River project, Heart Butte and Dickinson Dams."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, after line 2, to insert the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Office of Recorder of Deeds: For an additional amount for the "Office of Recorder of Deeds," $12,000, to be available for salaries and expenses of the Auto Lien Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a moment ago when I inquired about the dams in the Missouri River Basin I desired certain information with regard to them and I did not understand that Senators had stated on the floor that they were familiar with the projects. I was confused as to them. The Senator from South Dakota made a motion, and I was confused about the projects. He advises me that the motion resulted in action on the dam about which he had made a statement. In view of all the confusion on the floor of the Senate at the time, I wish now to make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia moves to reconsider the action previously taken by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, while we are considering the Interior Department items in the bill I should like to make a statement which I think should relieve the minds of some of my constituents in Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. President, in connection with the amendment included in the Interior Department appropriation bill transferring the Yuma air base property, buildings, equipment, material, and acquired lands to the Bureau of Reclamation, it is my understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will work out with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the War Department and the War Assets Administration, any necessary details for the operation of the hangars, runways, and immediate related facilities for an approved airport for the city of Yuma. Arrangements to this effect were under consideration when this amendment was adopted and everything should be done to make available to the people of Yuma and other agencies the constructed airport facilities at the air base. The city of Yuma and other agencies will, of course, be expected to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation in the operation and maintenance of these facilities so that the activities on the Gila project can be carried on effectively and economically.

At the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations it was explained that the transfer of the Yuma air base would be handled along the same lines as were the transfers of the War Relocation Authority camps in the 1947 Interior Department appropriation bill. The amendment to the 1947 bill provided that the War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition. It is my understanding that a similar arrangement will be made for handling the Yuma air base as is being carried out in connection with the War Relocation Authority camps. The funds required for this purpose are limited and would have to be expended by the War Assets Administration if the property were not turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is also my understanding that the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior for the disposal of lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations, including municipalities, school districts, and so forth, in connection with the war relo-

cation centers are to be used by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the Yuma Air Base in the most simplified form possible. The airport facilities, of course, may be leased to the city of Yuma or any other qualified agency.

This statement is made at this time in order that all concerned may understand that the amendment was intended primarily for the benefit of veterans in the settlement, operation, and construction activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, for the general activities of the Bureau, and for the communities it serves, in the order named, including especially the city of Yuma, for airport and other public purposes. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, delegate to the Commissioner of Reclamation any of the authority vested in him in connection with the handling of the air-base transactions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. I have been called out of the Chamber several times while the bill has been under consideration. I spoke to the Senator yesterday about this matter. Under the Taft-Hartley Labor Act all labor unions are required to register with the Department of Labor before a certain date, I think, in September. That is quite a task. I am advised by the Department of Labor that they have no force at this time to be assigned to the task, and they have no appropriation which would enable them to employ an additional force to do the work. Is there anything in the bill which takes care of that situation? Furthermore, unless the registration takes place there is no way by which the law itself can become effective, because it is a prerequisite to the knowledge of the Department as to labor unions throughout the country and to other functions with respect to further preparation for the enforcement of the act itself.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee I was very much aware of the Department's obligations under the act, and if the Senator will examine page 12 of the bill he will find a committee amendment covering that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and Public Health services, and for other purposes; and

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; and

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; and

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 41, and 42 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 58, and 64 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; and

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to have printed for its use additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947–48, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF THE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement made yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside and that the Senate return to Calendar 595, Senate Resolution 137.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. BROOKS. I ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of presenting a conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18 and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 pro-

grams carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal aprpopriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 59.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Illinois with reference to an item in the agricultural appropriation bill. I am not certain that the item is at this time in controversy——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that I have the floor, having yielded temporarily for the presentation of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The floor will be restored to the Senator as soon as this matter is disposed of.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to clarify this matter, let me say I have reference to the item in the agricultural bill having to do with meat inspection. Will the Senator please tell us whether that item was in dispute in the conference?

Mr. BROOKS. For the information of the Senator from Nevada, let me say there were four items in controversy. One was the meat-ispection item, one was the conservation-and-use item, one was the school-lunch-program item, and the fourth was tenant loans under the FHA. They were disposed of in the following manner:

As to tenant loans, the House voted a reduction of $35,000,000. The Senate restored $20,000,000. The conference has decided on $15,000,000.

As to the school-lunch program, the House voted $45,000,000 and eliminated the provision for matching funds derived from payments by the school children. In the conference the match provision was restored, and the appropriation was fixed at $65,000,000. As the conservation and use item, $30,000,000 was restored of the amount the House had voted to eliminate.

As to meat inspection, the Senator from Illinois will state that, reluctantly, we receded on the amendment on meat inspection, because the House was adamant. The conferees on the part of the House were unanimous, except for one Member. In the House, two votes were taken on this matter, and they were the largest of any votes taken in the House on amendments and other matters considered by the House. So, Mr. President, for the purpose of obtaining the enactment of a bill for the Agricultural Department, the Senator from Illinois reluctantly receded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I realize that at this late hour in the session it is not practicable to send this report back to a further conference. But in my opinion a great disservice has been rendered the people of the United States by taking out the item providing for public inspection at public charge of the meat consumed by the people of the United States. Today we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars year after year for public health. There cannot be anything more important than to see to it that the meat consumed by the people of our Nation is properly inspected by disinterested inspectors.

The result of taking the action recommended by the conferees will be, in my judgment, that all the small independent packers will go out of business, because the large packers will be able to have private inspection and will charge the cost of the inspection as part of the price of the commodities they sell. However, the small packers will not be able to compete, because they will not be able to pay for the private inspection. The result will be to close down the small packers and the independent packers everywhere.

However, that is not the worst feature of the situation. The worst feature is that governmental inspection of the food the people of this country use will be ended. Especially in view of the fact that the people are paying such high prices for

meat at the present time, certainly the inspection provision should be retained in this appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall yield in a moment, but first I must not let the statement the Senator from Nevada has made stand without an explanation of my position in reference to the observations the Senator from Nevada has made.

In the first place, the meat inspection will continue exactly as it has been conducted in the past. The inspectors will be Federal inspectors; they will be under civil service. We have not changed the law. I did not agree to this provision originally; but, as I stated before, I say again that I yielded on this point, for the purpose of having the bill enacted, and because of the importance of the other programs provided by the bill, such as the school-lunch program, the conservation and use program, and the tenant loan program, as to which—and they constitute a majority of the items in dispute—the will of the Senate has prevailed. The other conferees will state that I did object, but finally I yielded reluctantly on this point.

But so far as the inspection of meat is concerned, it will go on just the same as always, except in the case of a packer who does not wish to engage in interstate commerce with his meat. Anyone who wishes to engage in interstate commerce with meat must have it federally inspected. For all of the total number of pounds of meat slaughtered in the packing houses in the United States, and the $11,600,000 which it has cost the Government, the cost for meat inspection amounts to less than one-tenth of 1 cent a pound.

Even though I did not want to yield on this point, I believe that the packers themselves will more adequately emphasize, in advertisements and otherwise, the importance of having the Government stamp on their meat, and as a result the people will want the inspection made, and that will force the packers to have their meat inspected universally. Thirty percent of the meat is not inspected at the present time, under the present Federal inspection program, even though this law has been in existence for 40 years.

I was reluctant to yield on this point; but I say that anyone who wishes to engage in interstate commerce with meat must have it inspected. It will not be privately inspected.

The Department of Agriculture would not take a position on this matter. The chairman of the subcommittee questioned the representatives of the Department of Agriculture at length, trying to get from the Department an answer to the question, "How do you feel about this matter?" The only answer I got was that the meat inspection would continue. They would not even express their view as to whether this provision would diminish the amount of inspection.

So the Department has not expressed its view as to whether this provision is good or bad. The representatives of the Department simply say that this does not change the law or change the status of the inspectors or change anything, except that the packers will pay the inspection fees to the Government. The inspectors will still be Government inspectors, and still will have Government status and civil-service status and rights.

I think the packers brought this on themselves. The proposal did not come from me or from any other Member of the Senate, but the House was adamant. All but one of the conferees on the part of the House stood fast in their position that they wanted this inspection charge transferred to the packers. One of the reasons they assigned was that during the war, when the packers asked the civil-service inspectors provided by the Government to work overtime, the packers paid the overtime charges. So the packers are already paying a part of the salaries of the Federal inspectors, in the form of fees paid to the Government. This provision merely makes them pay all the salaries of the inspectors.

I say again that it means, in the overall program, less than one-tenth of one cent a pound. When people say that the cost of the inspection will be transferred to the consumers or to the producers, it is difficult for me to understand how it will be possible to transfer a cost of one-tenth of one cent a pound or how it will make a difference in maintaining the meat inspection program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what the able Senator from Illinois has said is true, but let me state what the result will be. As he has said, the small packers cannot ship their meat across State lines unless the meat and the meat products are federally inspected.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. That we agree upon. So the small packer must pay that additional item, in that he must pay for the Federal inspection. Otherwise he is confined to his State line. This one-tenth of 1 percent in the overall charge, or one-fiftieth of 1 percent, about which the Senator speaks, is scarcely felt by the big packer, because he is handling millions of pounds of meat, and it amount to but little. But with the little packer, who is handling a limited poundage of meat, it amounts to much, and much more than one-tenth of 1 percent.

In my judgment, the result is going to be that the little packer will not be able to stamp his meat "Federally inspected," because he will not be able to pay the charge of the civil-service inspector who will have to be in his packing house. Therefore the big packer may come along and say, "We have federally-inspected meat," and no one else can compete with him because the public wants federally inspected meat.

I make the prediction that the result will be that hundreds of the small packers of the country, who have limited territory, are going out of business, to the great augmentation of the business of the big packers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the school-lunch appropriation had been reduced to $65,000,000?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that amount be spent in strict accord with the law as it now stands, or has the committee surrounded the appropriation with limitations?

Mr. BROOKS. The law provides that $10,000,000 of whatever is appropriated must be spent for nonfood assistance, namely, equipment. We removed that restriction, so that it might be spent for food for the school lunches.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that this restriction will apply solely to the present appropriation, and will have no effect on the organic law?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to bear witness to the sincere effort made by the Senator from Illinois to maintain the provision in the meat-inspection appropriation. The amendment was voted into the bill in the first instance in the other body, and when the bill came to the Senate it was stricken out after hearings by the Senate committee. The bill went back to the House in disagreement, and the House took a second vote upon the matter. At that time effort was made for a yea-and-nay vote in the other body, but the Senate amendment did not have sufficient strength in the House even to get a call of the yeas and nays. Even those who were in favor of the Senate position agreed that the decision of the House would be the same if the amendment went back for another vote. Therefore it would have been futile for the Senate to attempt to maintain its position longer on that particular item.

On the whole I think we got a very good bill. There are provisions which were not very satisfactory to me, but we provided funds to enable the Government to carry on next year the most important farm programs.

The Senate will observe that the Senate conferees receded on the last House amendment, which allowed a total of $265,000,000 for soil-conservation payments. It was stated in the conference by those who have great familiarity with the program that in view of the pulling down of the program which was brought about by the action of the House in reducing the appropriation $165,000,000 in the first instance, that $265,000,000 would pay the farmers all to which they would have been entitled for soil conservation. It does not pay them in full. There will be a small balance, which we can seek to have appropriated in a deficiency bill next year.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have received communications from Oklahoma stating that some of the county offices would have to be closed if funds were not provided. Is

there sufficient money provided in the bill to keep the soil-conservation offices open?

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be that in some counties there are not extensive farm programs, and it will be necessary to consolidate, but it will be possible, with the funds for administration, at least to maintain a skeleton staff in all the offices.

The reduction in the administrative item was severe, there can be no question. The budget estimates were around $36,000,000 for all purposes, including the quota programs on tobacco and peanuts. The House figure was originally $15,000,000, and the conference figure was $22,500,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What was the original budget estimate for soil-conservation practices?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original budget estimate provided, roughly, for $300,000,000 for soil conservation and administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much is carried in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Two hundred and sixty-five million dollars.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the conference report will be agreed to. It is as good a bill as we could get. It was the result of long and tedious effort.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question with regard to the school-lunch program. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] propounded a question which the Senator from Illinois answered, but I should like to make doubly sure about the provision of $10,000,000 for nonfood assistance, which is to be found in the General Law, section 5, I think it is, which provides that of any sum appropriated, $10,000,000 is to be used for nonfood assistance. In the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, is that sufficiently negatived by the specific language in the conference report?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question in my mind, and it was made perfectly clear by the report, that the $65,000,000 will be used for getting food. There is a very obvious reason for that. If it was necessary to cut somewhere, it would have been folly to cut down on food, and have a program for $10,000,000 that would have been spread so thin over the United States. The most important part of the program is the getting of food for the school children. As much as the Senate conferees regretted to be compelled to surrender the $10,000,000 for nonfood purposes, we had to reach an agreement at some time, and we were compelled to make this agreement. There can be no question however that under the language of the bill, it takes the funds from section 32 funds rather than a direct appropriation from the Treasury. The entire $65,000,000 that will be carried when the bill is signed by the President will go for food for the school-lunch program.

Mr. O'CONOR. Notwithstanding the provisions of the general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. Notwithstanding the provisions of the general law, which are negatived by the language which is carried legislatively to divert the funds from section 32 sources.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I believe the amendments that were in question have been adequately explained.

I now move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3601, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*July 24, 1947.*

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$75,000,000" where it occurs in said amendment and insert "$65,000,000"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for non-food assistance under section 5 of said act."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59.

The motion was agreed to.

## INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, just prior to the call of the calendar last night we were proceeding with the consideration of Senate resolution 137. The resolution calls for an investigation of the immigration system of this country in its various phases.

I feel that in the discussion of last evening we rather thoroughly laid the whole subject before the Senate. I believe that it is understood. The resolution does not give any greater powers to the Committee on the Judiciary than exist at this time. It does provide an appropriation out of Senate funds which will enable the Committee to set up a staff to deal with the subject.

I have pointed out how imperative it is that this staff be created and go to work if we are really to ascertain the facts upon the subject of immigration and its various phases. So it is not my intention today to speak at length, because I hope that we may shortly bring the issue to a vote. I realize that there are Senators with other subjects which they desire to bring up, and I am going to have full respect for their position.

Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has closely followed this resolution. The resolution was first reported by the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously. Later, under our procedure, it having been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, that committee reported it without objection, and made the allocation of the funds for carrying on the work. Several Senators interested in the subject and various phases of it, have discussed with me certain amendments to effect the purpose they had in mind. Those amendments were submitted to the Judiciary Committee, and that committee has authorized me to present them upon the floor. One of the questions raised in committee was the problem of displaced persons. A number of Senators, not members of the Judiciary Committee, showed an interest in this subject. I want to make a part of my remarks at this time, by reading, a resolution adopted on July 24, which appears in the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary of that date. It reads:

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, each to designate one member of the committee of which he is chairman, to give to the Committee on the Judiciary their advice on the problem of displaced persons.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator mind reading that again? There was some noise here and I could not hear what the amendment was.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not an amendment. It is a resolution which was adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary when the Senator from New Jersey was appearing before that committee, on July 24, and this subject was before the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is the same amendment which had been proposed by the junior Senator from Michigan and placed on the table, submitted in behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], except that the date was changed and made 10th of January?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I am speaking now of a resolution adopted by the committtee—not an amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. But going back to the amendment, that amendment was approved by all the committee present at the meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator is now speaking of an amendment which was first suggested by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That amendment reads:

*Provided, however*, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations in a separate report with respect to displaced persons in Europe, on or before January 10, 1948.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is an amendment about which the Senator consulted me, and which was agreeable to me. It was submitted to the Judiciary Committee and received its unanimous approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point in his remarks for a clarifying question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment. I want to say the amendment will be offered by me in due course as a part of the pending resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point for a clarifying question in relation to the so-called Ferguson amendment, was the report to be made to the Judiciary Committee or to the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was to be made to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, is there a provision as to the date on which the Judiciary Committee shall report to the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; there is no provision as to when the full committee shall act on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. I have some further questions I want to ask the Senator, and I assume he would rather continue his discussion now, and will advise me when he is prepared for questions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am prepared to hear the Senator now.

Mr. SMITH. I have a number of questions which I want very much to propound.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to have the Senator ask the questions, because I do not intend to indulge in a long statement on the subject. We discussed it at quite some length last evening. I think the Senate very thoroughly understands what is in the resolution, and I want to proceed to a vote as quickly as we can so that a decision may be reached about the matter.

Mr. SMITH. I am in entire accord with the Senator's view. I should like to ask unanimous consent, to save time, to insert in the RECORD at the appropriate place in connection with my remarks certain editorials on this subject, which tend in a very effective way what the issue of displaced persons is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should prefer that they not be introduced at this point in the discussion.

Mr. SMITH. I meant at the close of my remarks today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall ask that they be placed in the RECORD with any statement the able Senator has to make. If the Senator has a question he wants to ask me, I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to postpone my request for the insertion of the editoriols in the RECORD, as the Senator requests.

I may preface my questions with this statement: As the Senator knows, the only difference I have had with him in the whole dicussion has been with regard to the scope of the inquiry. My first preference in dealing with the matter was to have it dealt with by a concurrent resolution of the House and Senate. I realize that time is past, and that cannot be done. It was in my judgment the proper way to deal with the subject of displaced persons, because it involves more questions in my judgment than simply immigration.

My second preference, as the Senator knows, would have been an amendment to his resolution, which would have set up a special displaced persons subcommittee, consisting, of course, of the judiciary group, but also consisting of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and any other committees that might be concerned with the problem. But I do not wish, if I can avoid it, to complicate the matter by offering amendments. It occurred to me that if I could ask the distinguished Senator a few questions, which will appear in the RECORD, and make plain what is the scope of the investigation, it would probably cover the situation, and we could go ahead and adopt the resolution without complications arising. So, if the Senator will answer the questions I have prepared, as briefly as possible, I will appreciate it.

Does the scope of the investigation which is contemplated include the following:

First. Our American foreign policy abroad, including our relations to the United Nations Organization and the cooperation with the International Refugee Organization on the displaced-persons question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, the Senator understands I can only answer for myself; I shall not attempt to answer for the committee, or the subcommittee that will act under the resolution, if adopted. According to my point of view, the subcommittee would act upon every subject which would be taken into consideration in the formation of any statute on this subject.

Mr. SMITH. For the moment, I will pass that question, and will probably return to it presently in connection with certain other questions. My second question is, Whether the proposed investigation would include the responsibility of the Army for the care of displaced persons now in Germany, and the time within which their settlement should be accomplished?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Naturally, my answer would be the same. We would inquire into any question which would affect legislation dealing with the subject. From my own point of view, we would certainly consider what had been done, and what the Army knew about that subject or any other subject dealing with immigration.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. My next question is this:

Does the Senator—and his committee, I assume, when I ask this question—recognize that there are two distinct phases to this problem of the displaced persons: First, a proper check-up on our immigrational laws, as the Senator has suggested, in order to see that undesirable aliens are kept out of the United States; and, second—and this is the phase I want to emphasize; I think it is the important one in this emergency we are facing—how we can cooperate with other nations of the world, through the United Nations, to solve the resettlement problem of displaced persons in the various countries of the world, and, in particular, what percentage the United States should be willing to admit in connection with such settlement in proportion to the percentage which other nations would admit?

Or does the Senator simply take the position that we are not committed by implication or otherwise to admit anyone?

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are not committed to bring in anyone.

Mr. SMITH. It is true we are not committed to bring in anyone, but——

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to have the situation made clear. We are not committed to bring in anyone, but we are dealing with a particular question. I know the viewpoint held by the able Senator. I am sure the committee will be glad to have the viewpoint of the Senator as to what he thinks should be done, and, on the basis of what we find, the committee will recommend what should be done.

Mr. SMITH. Further to bring out what I am trying to have brought out, I ask this question: Will the Senator agree that the solution of the problem of the displaced persons involves three aspects:

First. Foreign relations.

Second. The administration of the occupied areas where at the present time we have taken care of those 600,000 people.

Third. The resettlement in other countries of those people, including a fair share of them as immigrants into the United States.

Does the Senator agree that those problems are involved in the problem of displaced persons?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Those will be questions to be considered, certainly. They will be the questions that will be presented. But I do not for one moment wish to say what shall be done in answer to that.

Mr. SMITH. I am not pretending to say that now either. I am trying to find the scope of the inquiry.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Anything dealing with displaced persons, where they are today, what shall be done with them, is naturally within the scope of the inquiry. Let me say that the Judiciary Committee has directed me to offer another amendment to the resolution, which I am very glad to offer. That is on page 2, in the first line, under clause (4) that we shall add the language: "and all aspects of the displaced-persons problem."

In other words, clause (4) would then read:

"The situation with respect to displaced persons in Europe, and all aspects of the displaced-persons problem."

I do not think that language is necessary, but I am very glad to add it, because if we go into any part of the subject of immigration, whether it be with respect to immigrants who desire to come to this country, of who some desire to send here, of who some desire to bring here, whether they be displaced persons or not, we have got to go into every phase of the subject dealing with the problem.

Mr. SMITH. I deem then, from the Senator's answer that the report which he contemplates making on the tenth of January under the Ferguson amendment would include an answer to all the questions I have propounded to him covering these areas, such as the foreign policy of the United States, our foreign relations, the administration of the occupied area, and the question of how these poor people are going to be settled somewhere in the world.

[PUBLIC LAW 266—80TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 356—1ST SESSION]

[H. R. 3601]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

# TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For personal services in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of two (one at not to exceed $3,000) passenger motor vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, $2,050,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $87,560, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That, of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or

tracts of land: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

## PENALTY MAIL

For deposit in the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department, as required by the Act of June 28, 1944 (39 U. S. C. 321d) $3,486,000.

## RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 733), including in addition to the objects for which funds are available for such Act of August 14, 1946, and under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended, personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; over-all administration, planning, and coordination of research under section 10 pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (c); and necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Act, as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $2,500,000, of which such amount as shall be allotable to Alaska shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska", without matching requirement;

For research on utilization and associated problems pursuant to section 10 (a) of said Act, $3,000,000;

For cooperative research other than research on utilization of agricultural commodities and the products thereof, pursuant to section 10 (b) of said Act, $1,500,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946), $2,000,000;

In all, $9,000,000: *Provided*, That such sums as may be necessary for penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944, may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation therefor: *Provided further*, That for necessary printing and binding there may be transferred to, and made a part of, the item "Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture," such sums as are necessary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any

bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,125,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $136,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $1,500,000: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

## OFFICE OF INFORMATION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $575,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $13,975 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District of Columbia, $533,000; for preparation and display of exhibits, $128,400; and the preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $67,400: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom

to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), said Act being elsewhere herein referred to as the Organic Act of 1944, as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600) : *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

PRINTING AND BINDING

For printing and binding for the Department, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services, except as otherwise provided, $1,607,000, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220) ; and including not to exceed $207,000 for printing and binding two hundred thirty-one thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241) : *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjust-

ment Act of 1938, from funds appropriated to carry into effect the purposes of the National School Lunch Act approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under said Act, and from funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under section 32: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso shall not exceed $145,000.

## LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For necessary expenses, including exchange of reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals, and expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $660,000, of which not to exceed $484,924 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

## BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $2,143,400 for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,375,400: *Provided*, That no part of

the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

## OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $500 for newspapers, $503,000.

## INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL COMMITTEES

Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural surpluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, together with traveling and other necessary expenses relating thereto.

## EXTENSION SERVICE

### PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $8,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $274,000; in all, Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $22,832,950.

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration and coordination of extension work: For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the

Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $827,200, of which not to exceed $663,100 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

## AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

### OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Administrator at $10,000 per annum, and personal services in the District of Columbia, and for the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $481,500, and there shall be transferred to the Department, from Government surplus without reimbursement therefor, certain parcels of real property, valued at approximately $9,750, within the boundaries of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland, consisting of approximately eighty-eight acres of land known as the Paul Hense tract and approximately forty acres of land known as the Sampson tract: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided*, *however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

### SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special research work, including the planning, programing, coordination, and printing the results of such research, to be conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may designate or establish, and to which he may make allotments from this fund, including personal services in the District of Columbia; $1,203,000, of which amount $785,200 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out hi responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critica Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946, in connection with natura rubber, including personal services in the District of Columbia $349,000; and there shall be transferred to the Secretary, from Gov ernment surplus without compensation therefor, real property consist ing of approximately one hundred and seventy-three acres know as the Spence tract, one hundred and thirty-one acres of the Guidott tract, forty acres of the Arguelo tract, and twenty-five acres of the Alisal industrial site (all located in the vicinity of Salinas, California), including improvements and laboratory facilities and equipment thereon, and personal property, valued in all (procurement cost) at approximately $865,000.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

To enable the Secretary, through such officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the Territory of Alaska as he may designate, to establish and maintain a program for research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, $144,940, including printing and binding, the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and the construction or acquisition of necessary buildings and facilities without regard to restrictions of existing law. In carrying out such program the Secretary is authorized to use such authorities as have heretofore been made available by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Alaska, and by the laws of the United States, and to cooperate with the University of Alaska and with other public and private agencies. The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective from and after the date of the enactment hereof, until June 30, 1949, and the Secretary is authorized to take such steps and to issue such regulations as he may determine to effectuate the orderly discharge of his responsibilities hereunder. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary the use of such equipment and other facilities, buildings, and grounds of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, including its branches, as he may determine to be necessary, other than any land in general use heretofore for other university purposes, and the Secretary may to the extent deemed advisable continue the employment of the existing personnel of the station. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, there are hereby transferred for the use of the Secretary any unexpended balances now available, and any moneys hereafter received for credit thereto, of all funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature or acquired under authority of law for the construction, use, and development of the Territorial agricultural experiment station, the availability of such funds to be unaffected by this transfer. The moneys so transferred shall be available for the settlement, in such manner as the Secretary shall direct, of obligations outstanding at the time of the transfer. The Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the Land Grant College Acts.

## OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

### PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C., 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,661,268, none of which shall be available for Alaska; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, $7,161,268.

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $197,525 for personal services in the District of Columbia, to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–369, 370–383, 386, 386d–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $211,000; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, $114,700.

## BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $1,059,000 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of

1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, $1,305,500.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,045,000.

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, $6,750,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quarantine work, including the control and eradication of hog cholera and related swine diseases, southern cattle ticks, scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the supervision of the transportation of livestock, the inspection of vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 102) and the Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 522), and the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, $1,225,197.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $5,000,000, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as a working capital fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be designated as the "Meat inspection fund", which shall be available for all expenses necessary to furnish an adequate and efficient inspection or service, and hereafter every person, firm, public agency, or other organization furnished inspection or service under said laws, including inspection of meat and meat-food products offered for import or export and the inspection of horse meat and horse-meat products, shall pay the United States therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and at rates and fees to be fixed by him, which payments, to be deposited in the meat-inspection fund, shall provide full reimbursement for the estimated cost attributable to the furnishing of such inspection or service, including scientific and technical investigations and laboratory services; investigations relating to violations of, and authorized exemptions under, the laws relating to Federal meat inspection; supervisory, administrative,

statistical, business management, and other costs; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C., 431); and other necessary expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may require advance payment, posting of bonds, or other assurance of payment, in order to protect the interests of the United States, and may withhold or withdraw such inspection or service for nonpayment of charges or fees, or failure to provide the required assurance of payment: *Provided further*, That inspection or other technical services may be rendered to Government and other public agencies, upon request, under the terms and conditions herein provided: *Provided further*, That a schedule of obligations and reimbursements of the meat-inspection fund, as of the close of the last completed fiscal year, and as estimated for the current and ensuing fiscal years, shall be included in the Budget as submitted to Congress annually: *And provided further*, That payments shall be made for inspection or service rendered on and after July 1, 1947.

Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals, $315,000.

Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum: The sum of $43,000 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), including personal services in the District of Columbia.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

For expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia, in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations, $100,000, together with such sums from other appropriations of the Department as the Secretary may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country: *Provided*, That the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement

based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $540,912 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended by the Act of June 24, 1946 (Public Law 427), and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,011,000.

For repair of buildings, fence, electric line and feed bunk, recently damaged by tornado at the dairy field station, Woodward, Oklahoma, $5,300.

### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; for the operation and maintenance of airplanes; and for personal services in the city of Washington, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, $2,784,000.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, drug, condiment, oil, insecticide, and related crops and plants, $2,445,000, and there shall be transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, from Government surplus without compensation therefor, one sixty-five acre tract occupied by the United States Plant Introduction Garden under permit from the War Department and two adjacent small parcels of land, totaling in all approximately seventy-seven acres, situated at Chapman Field

Military Reservation, Dade County, Florida, and valued (procurement cost) at approximately $7,000.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, $379,280.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management; $1,466,000.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; $637,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), including travel expenses of the advisory council, $436,900, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be available for the acquisition of adjoining land, and not to exceed $2,500 may be expended for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574) as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

Southern Great Plains Field Station: For replacement and repair of buildings, equipment and supplies, utilities, fences and other general repairs and clean-up operations from damages due to the recent tornado at Woodward, Oklahoma, $45,600.

## BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149) and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes

and the purchase of not to exceed seven, and not to exceed $745,350 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, $2,961,300.

Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths, Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, and pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $2,972,100: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided, however*, That expenditures incurred for removal of trees infected with Dutch elm

disease from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,000,000.

CONTROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed three, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $2,050,000.

## BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, including not to exceed $237,746 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as follows:

Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for such purposes; and for the technological investigation of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack investigations; $511,500, and there shall be transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, from Government surplus without compensation therefor, a certain parcel of real property of approximately one acre (consisting of lots 37 and 38 of Deal and Kreiser Subdivision, and lots 24 and 25 of tract 728

in the city of Pasadena, California), valued at approximately $15,800.

Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components; the investigation and experimental demonstration of improved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval stores; and the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and utilization of naval stores, $152,550.

Regional research laboratories: For continuing the researches established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292), including research on food products of farm commodities, $5,000,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for the construction of a commodity and equipment storage building at the Western Regional Research Laboratory located at Albany, California.

### BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $305,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, for conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this subject, $800,000.

## WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $3,750,000, of which amount $582,000 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,974,650 of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,193,350 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

## FOREST SERVICE

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $1,083,378 for personal services in the District of Columbia, not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and the replacement of one passenger motor vehicle in the District of Columbia; to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest

fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $10,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National forest protection and management", and not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest fire cooperation" may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture", for forest fire prevention posters and related printed material, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administration, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $10,000 per annum, and for expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $650,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for

their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $24,014,891, of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the purchase of one nursery site.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $2,475,000.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,250,000, of which at least $11,050 shall be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods.

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, $822,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570), $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $76,125 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the

stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $660,034) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; in all, not to exceed $809,500, of which not to exceed $54,636 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; and not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Under Week's Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $750,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition.

Under special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

## FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, (1) $11,000,000 for forest development roads and trails, and (2) $5,300,000 for forest highways, which sums are authorized to be appropriated by the Act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all, $16,300,000 (including not to exceed $100,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia), to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and

maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $10,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Secretary.

## FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control: For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, $1,000,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances: *Provided further*, That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries.

## SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, including not to exceed $856,750 for personal services in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this Act shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval

of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,048,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $38,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects.

## LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (Public Law 179, Seventy-ninth Congress), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $1,600,000.

## PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including

the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the

United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

## SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $55,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,326,115.

## MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary, including not to exceed $2,211,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, $1,566,250.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigations and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when

received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $712,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), and for liquidating war food orders and coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 541b), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business; printing and binding; and not to exceed $150 for newspapers; $1,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,552,000.

Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency, and Standard Container Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruit and vegetables, approved May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $294,000.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471-476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,399,000.

United States Grain Standards Act: To carry into effect the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, $1,128,000.

United States Warehouse Act: To carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $585,000.

Federal Seed Act: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; and to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds, approved August 9, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $152,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing Congress.

Packers and Stockyards Act: To carry out the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $528,000.

Naval Stores Act: To carry into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $41,000.

Insecticide Act: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, $293,500.

Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), $138,000.

## COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), including not to exceed $153,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $530,000.

## FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia, to carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029), as amended, the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731), approved August 14, 1946, and Public Law 563, approved July 30, 1946, as follows:

Loans: Title I and section 43, $15,000,000; title II, $60,000,000.

Mortgage insurance fund: For the establishment of the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund pursuant to title I, $1,000,000.

Salaries and expenses: For the making and servicing of new loans, insuring mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, and the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers' Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, $21,000,000.

All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy loans in accordance with the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1947 and prior appropriations and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946

are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Secretary under the provisions of the Acts named above, and all notes and other evidences thereof and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the Acts referred to any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Secretary. For the purpose of making such loans or advances, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Secretary of Agriculture. Repayments to the Secretary of Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

## WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $1,750,000, of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $500 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $5,000,000.

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5 of said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, $225,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act.

Sections 3 (a) and 3 (f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, either without interest or at such rate of interest per annum, not in excess of the rate provided for in sections 4 and 5 of this Act, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to July 1, 1947, shall be adjusted to the interest rate, if any, established for loans made after June 30, 1947, in accordance with the foregoing provision: *Provided*, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed thirty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury of all such obligations, and to execute such trust instruments as shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the holding in trust by the Administrator of all such obligations for the Secretary of the Treasury as security for loans to the Administrator heretofore made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or made or to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. All rights, interests, obligations, and duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arising out of loans made or authorized to be made to the Administrator are, as of the close of June 30, 1947, vested in the Secretary of the Treasury; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer, as of the close of June 30, 1947, to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive all loans outstanding on that date, plus accrued unpaid interest, theretofore made to the Administrator under the provisions of this Act, and all notes and other evidences there of and all obligations constituting the security therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the unpaid principal of the loans so transferred, plus accrued unpaid interest through June 30, 1947. Subsequent to June 30, 1947, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make no further loans or advances to the Administrator; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, in lieu of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend or advance to the Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection

3 (a), any unobligated or unadvanced balances of the sums which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has theretofore been authorized and directed to lend to the Administrator. For the purpose of making loans or advances pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans or advances to the Administrator. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans or advances shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

"SEC. 3. (f) All money representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in payment of loans made to the Administrator by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Secretary of the Treasury; upon the payment of such loans all moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

## FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses including personal services in the District of Columbia: printing and binding; not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; not to exceed $750 for periodicals and newspapers; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration; in all, $561,000. Collections made pursuant to section 601 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 832), are hereby made available to reimburse this appropriation for the cost of examining and supervising the corporations, banks, associations, and other organizations as provided in said section.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. No funds appropriated or made available under this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or approves, or directs or authorizes

he approval of, any loan or advance by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, unless such oan or advance (1) is for the purpose of protecting the security for r assisting in the collection of a loan or advance theretofore made y the Corporation, or (2) is for use in and confined to a specific rea or region in which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have found hat such loans for specified agricultural purposes and for limited ime periods are necessary because of economic emergencies or production disasters. All loans and advances made pursuant to this section vill carry the full personal liability of the borrower, shall be secured y crops or livestock and such additional collateral as is deemed necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment, and will be accompanied by a certificate of refusal of the loan or advance by a local ank or the production credit association serving the area.

SEC. 3. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum ppropriations made for the Department under this title shall be vailable for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles, and for the ire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia, but the number of such vehicles purchased or otherwise acquired for all the activities of the Department for which appropriations are made under such title shall not exceed the total number indicated for purchase by the Department under the statements of proposed expenditures for purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles in the Budget.

SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 5. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for health service programs as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

SEC. 6. Appropriations and other funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year (except those appropriated or authorized in title II of this Act for such fiscal year) shall be available for the payment of claims pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601).

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organiza-

tion that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this title shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 8. Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this Act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the Act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525): *Provided*, That in expending the appropriation herein for "Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry," service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947.

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948".

## TITLE II—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

SEC. 201. The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the current fiscal year, namely:

Operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses, $5,000,000, including not to exceed $700 for newspapers.

Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504), $10,000,000.

SEC. 202. The following corporations are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary to carry out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $8,450,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, including not to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers, and not to exceed $30,000 for penalty mail: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: *Provided*, That no part of the sums appropriated in section 201 of this title shall be used for any crop insurance operations other than the continuation of the trial crop insurance program, as authorized, and expenses necessary in the liquidation of insurance contracts on the 1947 and prior crops of wheat, cotton, and flax: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to insure any 1948 or subsequent crop except wheat in not to exceed six hundred and thirty-three counties and flax in not to exceed eighty-seven counties, in accordance with section 508 (a) (1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, and five additional crops in 1948 under the provisions of section 508 (a) (2) of said Act, as amended, including corn and tobacco in not to exceed fifty counties each and cotton in not to exceed fifty-six counties, unless otherwise provided by legislation.

SEC. 203. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions specified under the head "General provisions" in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, shall be applicable to title II of this Act.

## TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

### EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Notwithstanding any other provision of section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 612 (c)), not more than $44,000,000 shall be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, for use in effectuating the purposes of that Act. To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $65,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act. The remainder of the fund appropriated by said Act for the fiscal year 1948 is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1947, and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately thereafter.

Approved July 30, 1947.